PROCEEDINGS OF THE
NEW JERSEY
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
VOLUME LXXIII, NUMBER 4. OCTOBER 1955
WHOLE NUMBER 283

The Battle of Monmouth Through Alexander Hamilton's Eyes

BROADUS MITCHELL

For the British, from Meschianza to Monmouth was pride before a fall. For the Americans, after the misery of Valley Forge, camping on a battlefield which they had won was bright achievement, moral as much as military. The battle of Monmouth, June 28, 1778, from all points of view was the most dramatic of the war. That of Trenton, its nearest competitor, was the surprise capture by a small force of a still smaller one; the plans of the patriots, laid in calm courage, worked out well. At Monmouth the brand was snatched from the burning, shame was turned to success. The disaffection and disgrace of General Charles Lee, America's second in command, further distinguished Washington's rescue of the day. This, for the sake of contrast, is a short description of events on that blistering field. First failure, to be sure, led to victory only qualified, but such was fortune, more enthralling than pat perfection.

The case of the two armies was reversed as compared with eighteen months before. Instead of the enemy pursuing Washington's depleted force westward across New Jersey, the Americans, in equal strength, were now in chase eastward. In fact, the mischance of the campaign, from General Washington's stand-

The Writer: Dr. Mitchell is professor of economics in Rutgers University, well known as an authority on Alexander Hamilton. He is the author of an earlier (1951) Proceedings article, "The Man Who Discovered Hamilton."

point, was because he must come up with a fleeing foe. Washington must divide his army to find before he could fight his enemy. The opposition of most of his officers to risking a full-fledged encounter further perplexed the Commander-in-Chief's problem.

We enjoy an unusually full record of Alexander Hamilton's part in preparation for, during, and as a result of the Monmouth battle. His service as aide to Washington, in camp and field, and as his champion, is not better illustrated than in this conflict. The engagement brought him into close personal contact with all of the leaders present—Washington, of course, and among the rest particularly Lafayette and Lee. Indeed, so involved was he that the history of the battle may be accurately written in terms of his doings. This tempts to a more detailed account than would otherwise be included here.

We can follow Lieutenant Colonel Hamilton day by day, and in part hour to hour, from his leaving Valley Forge with General Washington soon after sunrise June 19,[1] 1778, to his arrival on the field of Monmouth the 28th.

During this period of watchful pursuit of Sir Henry Clinton's force he was constantly engaged in assisting Washington, and soon Lafayette, to gather news of the enemy's movements and intentions and in organizing obstruction to their progress by militia and detached parties. The march commenced agreeably enough before it became vexed and then frantic. James McHenry, the fellow-aide who in his diary frequently addressed sportive remarks to Hamilton, pictured the pleasant scene at the first camp, "8 miles from Moors & 25 from Philad[a]. Headquarters at a Jonat[n] Fells [Doylestown]. A raining evening." The "Company . . . within Doors" included "a pretty, Fullfaced, youthfull, playfull Lass, & a Family of Quakers meek & unsuspicious. Hamilton thou shalt not tread on this ground, I mark it for my own."[2]

[1]Washington to Col. Daniel Morgan, June 18, 1778 (*Writings*, J. C. Fitzpatrick, ed., XII, 88). He had already helped Washington provide for the occupation of Philadelphia (instructions to James Mease, June 18, 1778, *ibid.*, p. 89; cf. Washington to Arnold, June 19, 1778, *ibid.*, pp. 94-95) and had prepared for the Commander-in-Chief information and queries placed before the last Valley Forge council of war, mapping plans in consequence of the enemy quitting Philadelphia (*ibid.*, pp. 75-78).

[2]Emmett MSS., 9295, NYPL. McHenry's conquest was boastfully self-denying: "The pretty girl gives me some excellent milk, & sits by me, & chats with me till bed time.

The next day, Saturday 20th, "A Rapid Mornings March" was made in spite of weather "excessive hot. some of the soldiers die suddenly."[3]

Thus began the torture of humid heat that fevered the advance to the day of Monmouth, when the mercury stood at ninety-six degrees. Hamilton was doubtless with Washington when the General reached the ferry at noon on Sunday the 21st, soon crossed and took quarters at Holcombe's house.

"Here are some charming Girls," recorded McHenry, "but one of the Drums of the General's Guard more a favorite than Hamilton."[4]

Neither aide could have dallied long, however, for both had writing to do for Washington. Reports of the enemy's movement, to Moore's Town and Mt. Holly, coupled with departure of their shipping, indicated that Clinton would "traverse the Jerseys." Hamilton explained this, for Washington, to Gates, who commanded at Peekskill.[5]

The route Clinton would take—whether to some point on the Raritan River or Bay, or to Sandy Hook—was yet a mystery which Washington sought to solve by every means of information he could rally.[6] Hamilton was soon to become a vital part of this intelligence system.

She was no subject for gallantry, & too innocent to attempt sudden mischief—so I kissed her hand, telling her we shou'd be all gone before she got up; but not to forget that one Man is often more dangerous to a woman than a whole army." (Commas supplied for dashes in punctuation.) Cf. W. S. Stryker, *Battle of Monmouth,* p. 68, putting Washington's marquee near Fell's house, headquarters at Dr. Sherman's, but which in General Orders of that day appears as Shennons and in the H.Q. Expense Account as Shannons (*Writings,* XII, 93 and *n.*). Hamilton was occupied a part of that evening in writing for the General to Benedict Arnold (*ibid.,* pp. 94-95).

[3]McHenry, in *ibid.* The diary, the entries not dated, was probably posted tardily, which accounts for his omitting the camp of that rainy afternoon and night at Buckingham, "within Ten Miles of Coryel's ferry" (New Hope-Lambertville). Washington to Congress, *ibid.,* p. 97. The General ordered a gill of spirits to every man that afternoon (*ibid.,* p 98) as again on the 21st (*ibid.,* p. 104).

[4]*Op. cit.*

[5]Washington, *Writings,* XII, 104.

[6]See Washington to Governor Livingston, *ibid.,* p. 100, and to Gen. Dickinson, p. 103. The good reasons for Washington's difficulties in knowing the enemy's whereabouts are today hard to understand. Clinton with some ten thousand men and a baggage train twelve miles long (because the roads were few and narrow) was moving at snail's pace, five or six miles a day, with New Jersey militia and detached continentals, some mounted, hanging on his flanks. Deserters in large numbers came in to the Americans, and the maximum area involved was a hundred miles one way and thirty or forty the other.

Brilliant results might impend if the enemy, vulnerable because encumbered and on the move, was attacked in force. Since Burgoyne's surrender, only Clinton's army remained to be destroyed and the war would be won. On the other hand, Washington's troops, recently and only partially recovered from the distresses of Valley Forge, and scattered to provide against unknown contingencies, might prove the victim. Should this risk be run when the French alliance, with the arrival of d'Estaing's fleet, was already a military fact? Caution would reap a more certain though more patient reward. How far this would be deferred, by enemy resistance, problems of American-French land and naval co-operation, and by involvement in jealous European diplomacy, Washington could not foresee. This was the portentous speculation that obsessed headquarters in those anxious, toilsome, watchful days of June.[7]

Hamilton among the juniors, as we shall see, and Wayne and Calwalader were for chancing it, and as the two armies crept forward the judgment of Washington, Lafayette, Greene, Steuben, and others hardened to this resolve.

A short march the morning of June 23rd brought the army to a halt at Hopewell Township "near the Baptist Meeting," a dozen miles west and north of Princeton. Clinton's force had reached Black Horse[8] or perhaps even Allentown,[9] the latter less than ten miles southeast of Trenton and some twenty-five from Washington's position.

Hamilton promptly expressed the doubt in Washington's mind that was to keep him at a pause for two days. "It was my intention to have taken post nearer Princeton," he wrote for the General, "but finding the enemy are dilatory in advancing, I am doubtful of the propriety of proceeding any farther, till their intentions can be ascertained." He wished to know of obstructions placed in their way so he might judge whether they delayed from choice or from necessity. If from choice, it meant the enemy wanted to draw him into a general action, or perhaps intended to coax him from the Delaware, flank his right, and gain his

[7]Cf. D. S. Freeman, *Washington*, V, 13-14.

[8]Now Columbus, N.J.; Philemon Dickinson to Washington, June 23, 1778; Washington Papers, Library of Congress, LXXVIII, 10.

[9]William B. Reed, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed*, I, 368.

rear. He wished to be immediately advised of every movement and appearance of the King's army, dispatches to bear the precise hour.[10]

In spite of first orders to be ready "for a march or Action very early in the morning" of the 24th, the army was held over, disposed of heavy baggage, cooked rations, cleaned arms, and rested while Washington awaited developments and placed possibilities before his general officers for their advice.[11]

Hamilton was an absorbed auditor as one after another gave his answer to the Commander-in-Chief's queries: Should he choose to hazard a general action? If so, how? If not, what safe means would annoy the enemy's march? Hamilton wrote out the decision, signed by all but Wayne, who wanted to bring on a decisive battle; others, outwardly at least, were content with advancing fifteen hundred more men to worry the enemy's left flank and rear while the main body remained nearby to be governed by events. This result of the council, said Hamilton, "would have done honor to the most honorable society of midwives, and to them only. The purport was, that we should keep at a comfortable distance from the enemy, and keep up a vain parade of annoying them by detachment."[12]

General Charles Lee's inhibitions, delivered with authority, ruled many: let Clinton cross New Jersey unhampered; the French alliance was America's promise of victory; equal numbers of Americans could not battle succesfully with trained European soldiers. Others of bolder purpose so far yielded as to accept the compromise of sending a skirmishing party.[13] Those that were not dissuaded from their own views—Lafayette, Wayne,

[10]Hamilton Papers, L.C., I, 119; this is a draft in Hamilton's hand, dated Hopewell, etc., June 23, 1778, quarter past one o'clock, endorsed with Washington's autograph signature. No address is given, but J. C. Hamilton, *Life,* I, 193, and *History,* I, 465-66, says it was to Cadwalader; the letter is not in Fitzpatrick's *Writings of George Washington.* Cf. Washington to Council of War, June 24, 1778 (*Writings,* XII, 116) and to President of Congress, July 1, 1778 (*ibid.,* p. 140).

[11]R. H. Harrison drafted the propositions for the council's deliberation (*ibid.,* pp. 115-17).

[12]Hamilton to Elias Boudinot, July 5, 1778, and *Pennsylvania Magazine,* II, 140; Lodge, *Works,* IX, 140-42, took his text from J. C. Hamilton, *History,* I, 468, 478-79, with unfortunate omissions and a careless typographical error, but with correct date. Council of war decision is in Washington Papers, L.C., LXXVIII, 33.

[13]Lafayette, *Memoirs,* 1837, I, 50; Letters of Lafayette to Washington, 46-47.

and Greene—individually wrote Washington urging that he disregard timid counsel.[14]

The story that after the council of war broke up Hamilton solicited Greene to go with him to beg Washington to give battle is doubtful; the addition that the Commander-in-Chief agreed, and thus "an attack was decided"[15] is more so. However, the young aide was surely the cordial supporter, if not the actual companion, of General Greene in efforts to produce a blow. A score of years later, honoring Greene's memory, Hamilton stigmatized the faint-hearted advice others gave Washington before Monmouth. He condemned "those impotent councils, which, by a formal vote, had decreed an undisturbed passage to an enemy returning from the . . . fruits of his victories, to seek an asylum from impending danger . . . dispirited by desertion, broken by fatigue, retiring through woods, defiles, morasses . . . in the face of an army superior in numbers, elated by pursuit, and ardent to signalize their courage." But the courageous Greene "left nothing unessayed to avert and to frustrate so degrading a resolution."[16]

Making the best of the decision of his council of officers, Washington from Hopewell the 24th sent Brigadier General Charles Scott forward with nearly fifteen hundred good troops to co-

[14]Lee's prestige had not suffered appreciably by his laggard response to Washington's calls in the retreat across New Jersey in 1776, nor by his carelessness that resulted in his ignominious capture at Basking Ridge. Elias Boudinot, Commissioner of Prisoners, suspected Lee's duplicity with General Howe, but his misgivings had no bearing at this juncture. See the incident of Dr. David Griffith's warning to Washington concerning Lee the night before the battle, given (with no citation of authority) in G. W. P. Custis, *Recollections and Private Memoirs of Washington,* pp. 290-91. Letters of Lafayette to Washington, III, 46-47; Wayne, in Rupert Hughes, *Washington,* III, 348; Greene in Washington Papers, L.C., LXXVIII, 35.

[15]J. C. Hamilton, *History,* I, 467, and *Life,* I, 194; no authority is offered, and the scene in Washington's "tent" is at variance with the fact that his headquarters were in a house, either John Hunt's (Freeman, *Washington,* V, 15*n.*) or Joseph Stout's (Stryker, *op. cit.,* pp. 75-76; *n.*). The attributed argument sounds like Greene's letter to Washington, supra: "If we suffer the enemy to pass . . . without attacking, I think we shall ever regret it . . . People expect something from us and our strength demands it."

[16]"Eulogium on Major-General Greene," delivered before the Society of the Cincinnati, July 4, 1789, in Lodge, *Works,* VIII, 68. Hamilton praised the "noble fortitude" with which the Commander-in-Chief rescued himself and his army "from the disgrace with which they were both menaced by the characteristic imbecility of a council of war" (*ibid.*).

operate with the smaller detachments[17] "to gall the enemys left flank and rear."[18] Morgan was to gain the right flank,[19] while small bands of foot under General Cadwalader and of horse under Colonel White were pressing up.

Thus far Washington had acted in accordance with the advice of his generals, but with the move of the army the morning of June 25th to Kingston,[20] four miles northeast of Princeton, he began to assert his command, moral and military, as necessity plainly required. Lafayette, with a new force of one thousand men under Wayne, was sent forward to attack the enemy in flank and rear, all of the American detachments, amounting to about six thousand troops, to take the Marquis's orders. He was empowered to commit them all in an engagement.[21]

Washington, seeing that the British were taking the shortest route to the sea, by Monmouth Court House,[22] and would soon escape him, left off pestering and prepared for punishing them.

Lafayette and Wayne were leaders eager for action. Washington gave command to the Marquis only after he secured the acquiescence of Charles Lee. Hamilton described the vexing exchanges brought on by self-esteem. "General Lee's conduct . . . was truly childish. According to the incorrect notions of our army, his seniority would have entitled him to the command of the advanced corps; but he in the first instance declined it in favor of the marquis. Some of his friends having blamed him for doing it, and Lord Stirling having shown a disposition to interpose his claim, General Lee . . . inconsistently reasserted his pretensions. The matter was a second time accommodated, General

[17]Hamilton penned the order (Washington, *Writings,* XII, 114); several of the regiments of continentals in Scott's command (cf. Stryker, p. 78) were to behave well in the battle. Maxwell was to aid Scott against the left flank (Washington, *Writings,* XII, 113-14).

[18]To Dickinson, *ibid.,* p. 113.

[19]To Morgan, *ibid.,* p. 115.

[20]*Ibid.,* p. 140.

[21]*Ibid.,* p. 117; this order gave the sub-command to Poor, but Washington in reporting to Congress (*ibid.,* p. 140) corrected it to Wayne, also given by Hamilton in his account (Lee Papers, II, 467).

[22]Washington, *Writings,* XII, 140. "The project was," said Hamilton, "that this advanced corps should take the first opportunity to attack the enemy's rear on the march, to be supported or covered . . . by the whole army." (Lee Papers.)

Lee and Lord Stirling agreed to let the marquis command. General Lee, a little time after, recanted again and became very importunate. The general (Washington) who had all along observed the greatest candor in the matter, grew tired of such fickle behavior, and ordered the marquis to proceed."[23]

Now began for Hamilton four days of riding, gathering and giving intelligence as liaison officer between scattered portions of the army that must be concentrated for action against the enemy. At no other juncture in the war was his field service as aide so varied, intensive, and protracted. June 25th he went ahead of Lafayette,[24] to whom he was assigned, to Cranbury, roughly equidistant, a dozen miles, between Washington at Kingston to the north, the moving column of Clinton about Allentown to the south, and English Town, the main army's future camp, to the east. Heat, rain, and woodsy tracks connected the dispersed villages.[25]

Hamilton's first care was to inform Lafayette on the positions, as best he could, of enemy and American forces. The British rear was five miles east of Allentown on the Monmouth road. Hamilton would appoint a place of rendezvous and notify Maxwell at Hyde's Town (Hightstown), Dickinson and Morgan, "said to be on the enemy's right flank; but where, cannot be told," and Scott

[23]J. C. Hamilton, *History,* I, 468. On Lee's claim to command, which was in contrast to his earlier opposition to any attack, see his letter, Camp, Kingston, June 25, 1778, to Washington (Lee Papers, II, 417-18); he had at first "consider'd it as a more proper busyness of a Young Volunteering General than of the Second in command of the Army," but he was now persuaded that ceding so large a corps of picked troops intended to act independently would "have an odd appearance" or disgrace him. He added his reservations about the detachment marching at all. Hamilton, though he mentioned a second consent on Lee's part, which does not otherwise appear in the record, neglected to say that Washington did in the end feel compelled to put Lee, with additional brigades, in command of the whole forward body. To save the feelings of Lafayette, who was creditably amenable, Lee was not to interfere with any design Lafayette had in hand, but was to aid it. See Washington to Lafayette, Cranbury, June 26, 1778, (*Writings,* XII, 119), the same to Lee (*ibid.,* p. 120), and Lafayette; Hightstown, June 26, to Washington completely accepting the compromise (Lee Papers, pp. 418-19).

[24]Hamilton to Lafayette (copy), from Dr. Stiles' House, Cranbury Town, 9 o'clock (P.M., June 25, 1778), Hamilton Papers, L.C., I, 120; printed in Lodge, *Works,* IX, 137.

[25]The present open countryside, with paved highways that span streams and erstwhile bogs allows little notion of the troubles of transport and communication in the same area at that time, when bodies of hundreds or thousands of troops might be lost to each other. Landmarks remain, especially an unusual number of old houses.

who "from circumstances . . . is probably at Allen Town." Meantime, Lafayette should move toward Cranbury. The letter should be sent back to Washington. Hamilton was galloping to meet Maxwell and would report further. He added a postscript that Scott, at five o'clock in the afternoon, passed Hooper's Tavern five miles from Allen Town.[26]

Difficulties increased next day. Hamilton was with Lafayette's force at Robin's Tavern, eight miles east of Allen Town. As the enemy had passed the fork to South Amboy, he wrote Washington, they were making toward Shrewsbury (Monmouth on the way). The troops were out of provisions, Wayne's men, particularly, were famished and rebelled against moving from the present halt until commissary wagons came up. The intelligence system—which Washington had striven to provide—had been neglected, the enemy had escaped Lafayette's pursuit, now brought to a stop by hunger. Worse, Hamilton continued, "We are entirely at a loss where the army is . . . If the army is wholly out of supporting distance, we risk the total loss of the detachment in making an attack," which they were anxious to do within the limits of prudence.[27]

Prudence was stressed by Washington in his prompt replies that day. Perhaps the eagerness of Lafayette, further stimulated by that of Hamilton, might precipitate a premature stroke. The troops should not be pushed too hard in the heat. Food was on the way, but his own army was halted for the want of it.[28]

Hamilton replied, the night of the 26th,[29] giving important information and reassuring the Commander-in-Chief on the score

[26]To Lafayette, June 25, 1778, *supra.*

[27]Hamilton (to Washington) from Robin's Tavern, 8 miles from Allen Town, 12 o'clock, June 26 (1778), a copy in Hamilton Papers, L.C., I, 121; printed in Lodge, IX, 138-39. Lafayette had written Washington from Hightstown, at quarter after seven (P.M.) June 26, 1778, that when he arrived he was sorry to hear that Hamilton, who had been riding all night, had been unable to find anybody who could give him certain intelligence. Lafayette learned otherwise that the enemy were in motion, their rear seven or eight miles away. He was moving after them and might attack in the morning if they did not elude him in the night, "which I much fear, as our intelligences are not the best ones." He would be confident of striking a blow if Washington was near him. (Lee Papers, II, 418-19.)

[28]Washington, *Writings,* XII, 121-22.

[29]Hamilton to Washington (copy), Hamilton Papers, L.C., I, 122, wrongly dated June 28, as it is in Lodge, *Works,* IX, 139-40; Washington, *Writings,* XII, 123 *n.*, misdates it 27th.

of Lafayette's caution. The enemy was encamped with the van slightly beyond Monmouth Court House. To attack them without support of the whole army would be "folly in the extreme," especially because they had rearranged their march to put the baggage in front and close the rear with their best light troops, with a guard of a thousand men a quarter-mile back of the main body. However, a plan of assailing them, if Washington was prepared to come up, was outlined.

Hamilton had written this far when Lafayette received an order from Washington at Cranbury,[30] to march to English Town where the main army could better support his attack or cover his retreat. Lafayette's detachment would be put in motion, accordingly, said Hamilton, at three o'clock next morning (the 27th).[31]

Lafayette replied separately that in consequence of these instructions he had given up the project of attacking, wished only to join Lee, and would march at two next morning. He could not resist adding, "I do not believe General Lee intends to make any attack tomorrow, for then I would have been directed to fall immediately upon them without making eleven miles entirely out of the way. I am here as near as I will be at Englishtown."[32] At English Town Lafayette and Hamilton were reunited with the main army under Washington.

Hamilton's condemnation of General Charles Lee's retreat at Monmouth sprang from several causes. First, Hamilton penned, for Washington, the written order to attack, which Lee disregarded. Hamilton's accuracy in embodying Washington's intention and in reporting to the court martial his recollection of the text were impugned when Lee disputed the wording. Second, Lee disparaged the military and personal conduct of the Commander-in-Chief on the field, both of which Hamilton admired.

[30]Washington, *Writings,* XII, 122-23; this repeated an order of two hours before which has not survived.

[31]When that hour arrived Hamilton dashed off a dispatch to Brigadier General Scott: "This part of the troops marches instantly—We are to join in the Monmouth road one mile this side of Taylor's Tavern. You will govern yourself accordingly. If you can find Morgan let him be desired again to keep close to the enemy and attack when we attack. You will endeavour to keep up a communication of intelligence." William Alexander Smith Coll., N.Y.P.L.; Washington, *Writings,* XII, 124 *n.*, says it is in Metropolitan Museum, New York City.)

[32]Half past 10 P.M., June [26] 1778, Lee Papers, II, 425-26; also Letters of Lafayette to Washington.

Third, Hamilton all along had been for giving the enemy a blow; he had deplored the obstructionist influence of many of his elders, and had worked manfully, before and in the battle, to organize the attack. Fourth, Hamilton's close association with Lafayette in these operations gave him a care for that spirited officer's reputation, which was injured by Lee's feckless command of the advance troops. Hamilton at no time drew out these reasons in so many words, but they are fairly inferred from circumstances.

What happened at Monmouth is readily understood if the physical features of the battlefield are clearly in mind. It was[33] an open plain some two and a half miles long and a mile wide, with the village of Monmouth Court House (since Freehold) at the eastern end, with hills enclosing the western end, the highest at the center, crowned by Tennent Church (still standing).

However, of special importance, the field was cut, roughly north and south, by three ravines—one directly in front of the village, one in the middle, and the last below the eminence on the west. The boggy bottom of each was spanned by a single narrow causeway. English Town, where the main army, including most of the force under Lee, lay the night before the action, is four miles west and a little north of Tennent Church; that is, at the beginning nearly seven miles separated Americans and British.

We shall not be concerned with details of the engagement except as Hamilton figured in giving or helping to execute orders. Lee, commanding the large detachment, came up with the enemy about eight o'clock in the morning of June 28th.[34] It was probably a couple of hours after this that Hamilton was sent by Washington from English Town to reconnoitre. He fell in with Lee some distance west of the Court House, his troops in confusion. Hamilton urged Lee to order Lafayette to attack the left flank, which was done. Hamilton returned to Washington to report.[35]

He met the General advancing at the head of the main army

[33]Changes have been made, a few in the terrain itself; cf. Freeman's description, *Washington*, V, reverse of p. 29.

[34]Letter of Generals Wayne and Scott to Washington, June 30, 1778, as published in Lee Papers, II, 438-40.

[35]*Proceedings of a General Court Martial . . . for the Trial of Major-General Lee*, 1778, p. 66, Hamilton's testimony; J. C. Hamilton, *History*, I, 473, says Hamilton had gone forward with Lafayette "before break of day," but this does not seem to be supported by the evidence.

not far west of Tennent Church. Lee, he declared, would soon engage. Hamilton recommended, with reasons "which were thought good," that the right wing, under Greene, should be thrown to the south "and . . . follow with the left wing [under Stirling] directly in General Lee's rear to support him." This order was being given when a countryman brought news of a retreat. Washington could not believe it even when a soldier gave the same tidings. He was soon face to face with the ugly fact. Lee, when he found his tongue, offered explanations which Washington dismissed as fast as uttered.[36]

Soon Lee was sent to the rear while Washington, on the hillside below the church, reversed the retreat, gave swift orders for artillery support from the flanks, put vigor in all, and drove the enemy from the field. "I never saw the General to so much advantage," said Hamilton shortly after. "America owes a great deal to General Washington for this day's work. A general rout, dismay and disgrace, would have attended the whole army in any other hands but his . . . Other officers have great merit in performing their parts well, but he directed the whole with the skill of a master workman. He did not hug himself at a distance and leave an Arnold to win laurels for him, but by his own presence he brought order out of confusion, animated his troops, and led them to success."[37]

Boudinot in reply (from his seat in Congress) was distressed that Lee, entrusted with America's safety, "would be capable of betraying her Interest in the critical moment of decision . . . " "The General," he declared, "I allways revered & loved ever since I knew him, but in this Instance he has rose superior to himself. Every Lip dwells on his Praise . . . The share that the family . . . has in the Honors of victory afford[s] me real pleasure . . . " (A.L.S., July 8, 1778, H.S.P.). Boudinot's acknowledgment to Washington's military family involved Hamilton in a sequel. The "Jerseyman" drew on the aide's account for a letter in the *Pennsylvania Packet,* of July 16, 1778.[38] Hamilton remarked to

[36]Tench Tilghman, in *Court Martial,* pp. 91-92.

[37]Hamilton to Boudinot, July 5, 1778, Lee Papers, II, 467 *ff.*; Hamilton's contrast was with Gates at Saratoga.

[38]Extracted in *New Jersey Archives,* Second Series, II, 303-06.

Boudinot, who he had reason to know was the writer, that the publication "gave me pain . . . I mean the part of it where it is said, 'even the Secretaries caught the general contagion and by putting themselves in places of danger, shared some of the honors of the day.' The turn of the paragraph has something in it derogatory," though that was not intended. "It is a pity the matter could not be explained, for it is a truth, that the Secretaries . . . made as great exertions, and deserved as much credit in every respect, as any officers of the army." He hoped Boudinot would have this paragraph published, as that to which he objected "has very sensibly affected our friends Harrison and Tilghman" (postscript in Hamilton's hand, signed "A H" evidently to Boudinot, endorsed July 26, 1778, H.S.P.). The incident showed Hamilton's regard for the feelings of associates in "the family," and also why he insisted that staff assignment should not make him ineligible for field command. Even had not Lee written Washington discourteous letters, inviting a court martial, he might have been ordered to trial; his actions after the battle made it inevitable.[39]

Hamilton's part in command that day was assumed in the emergency. To Lee and Washington he proposed dispositions of troops, but he helped Livingston and Olney, especially the latter, in posting their men for protection of artillery pieces which were in danger of capture in the enemy advance. After the forming of Olney's line, Hamilton's horse was shot and in the fall the Colonel was so hurt that he was compelled to retire from the action.[40]

Hamilton testified twice at the court martial, first the opening

[39]The correspondence is conveniently found in Stryker, *op. cit.*, Appendix IX, pp. 282-84.

[40]*Court Martial,* Hamilton's testimony, pp. 69, 71-72, and Olney's, p. 146. "I am happy to have it in my power to mention the merit of your friend Hammy," wrote James McHenry to Elias Boudinot. "He was incessant in his endeavours during . . . the whole day—in reconnoitering the enemy and in rallying and charging. But whether he or Col. Laurens deserves most of our commendation is . . . doubtful—both had their horses shot under them, and both exhibited singular proofs of bravery. They seemed to court death . . . and triumphed over it as the face of war changed in our favor." He went on to signalize the similar work of Fitzgerald, Meade, Harrison, and Tilghman. (New Brunswick, July 2, 1778, Emmett MSS., 9394, N.Y.P.L.) A brief, spirited description of the day—the Americans' retreat, resistance, and counter-attack—is in Anthony Wayne to his wife, Spottswood (N.J.), July 1, 1778 (Wayne Papers, V, 57, H.S.P.).

day, July 4th, at New Brunswick, and on the 13th at Paramus.[41] Both times his testimony was important—as evidenced, for example, by Lee's cross-examination of him—and must have carried weight with the court. The essential information sought to be drawn from the witnesses Scott, Wayne, Fitzgerald, and Meade was whether Washington had ordered Lee to attack, if so with intent to bring on a general engagement, and what degree of discretion was allowed to Lee by the Commander-in-Chief. Hamilton was the first who could so much as refer to a written order.

He explained, in answer to the judge advocate's question, that he wrote Lee the night before the battle a letter "by General Washington's order, a copy of which I have not; but it was conceived in the spirit, as I understand, of former orders that had been given by him to General Lee, and was occasioned by an apprehension (as declared to me by General Washington) that the enemy might move off . . . and get out of our reach, so that the purpose of an attack might be frustrated . . . the order directed that General Lee should detach a party of 600 or 800 men to lie very near the enemy . . . in case of their moving off to give the earliest intelligence of it, and to skirmish with them so as to produce some delay, and give time for the rest of the troops to come up." Lee was to direct Morgan, in case the enemy had marched, to attack with the same object, "and yet not so as to endanger a general rout of his party, and disqualifying them from acting in concert with the other troops when a serious attack should be made. This, I understood from General Washington, was in pursuance of his intention to have the enemy attacked." The letter was sent by a lighthorseman and Hamilton had given the purport of it to the best of his recollection.[42]

[41]The court sat also at North Castle, and gave its judgment and sentence at Peekskill August 12. Shortly after his second testimony Hamilton was dispatched (July 18) to Black Point, N.J., to concert measures with Count d'Estaing, and was delayed by several causes from returning to headquarters before July 26th (to Washington, July 20, 23, 1778, Lodge, *Works,* IX, 145*n.*). Because of this distraction, or because the trial was in progress, Hamilton made no allusion to Lee's conduct in any surviving letter of these weeks save in that to Elias Boudinot, July 5, describing the battle and ending: "What think you now of General Lee? Whatever a court martial may decide, I shall continue to believe and say,—his conduct was monstrous and unpardonable." (*Ibid.,* p. 142, taken from J. C. Hamilton, *History,* I, 479, where [p.468] the letter is misdated 1777).

[42]*Court Martial,* p. 22.

Lee took pains to bring out, in questions put to Hamilton and through testimony of his own aides, Mercer and Edwards, that Washington's orders reached him at a late hour, one or two o'clock in the morning.[43] The implication was that Washington, or certainly Hamilton, had been tardy and that the Commander-in-Chief had not signed the order. In the hurry of those last hours the usual rule of keeping a copy of dispatches had been disregarded. Lee did not produce the orders at the trial, which means there was nothing in them to contradict Hamilton's recollection, and this most crucial document in the affair of Lee has never turned up from that day to this.[44]

Lee pressed Hamilton, in cross-examination, to say that Washington left Lee a measure of discretion, this being essential to Lee's whole defense. Lee cited a hypothetical case; Hamilton readily declared that Washington did not bind Lee under all, unforeseeable, circumstances, and that his own language given to the court was more explicit and full than he had ever used in written or spoken word to Lee. But, he ended, "from everything I knew . . . General Washington's intention was fully to have the enemy attacked on their march, and that the circumstances must be very extraordinary . . . which, consistent with his wish, could justify the not doing it."[45]

Hamilton's next testimony bore harder upon Lee for his conduct on the field, and later drew from that officer sarcastic jibes against Washington's young aide. Lee, said Hamilton, had under his command more than half the army, five thousand troops plus fourteen hundred that had been told off to co-operate with him. Sent by Washington to reconnoitre the country between him and

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

[44] The episode shows the trust reposed by Washington in his aide, Hamilton, to embody the General's intentions in accurate language that would yet comprehend the several contingencies present in the situation. Probably some letters that Hamilton wrote for Washington, and for which the latter held himself responsible, were never seen by the Commander-in-Chief. What battle preparations demanded was not only intelligence in transmitting orders, but good faith in interpreting and executing them. It was in this essential that Lee offended. Even had the written orders been offered in evidence, and been precisely what Hamilton reported, Lee, judging by all his conduct on this and previous occasions, would have sought means to justify his departure from directions.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 13; testimony of Lafayette, Forman, Laurens, and others, *ibid.*, p. 19 *ff.*, confirmed Hamilton's evidence that Washington designed an attack which Lee had not made.

Lee's corps, Hamilton found the latter in some confusion. He suggested to Lee to order Lafayette to attack the enemy's left flank, which was done. Hamilton "saw nothing like a general plan or combined disposition for a retreat . . . " In the two orders he heard Lee give, Lee seemed "under a hurry of mind," and lacked the calm and steadiness necessary to support an officer under such critical circumstances.[46]

As Lee was claiming that his retreat was deliberate strategy, he must confute, if he could, statements of Hamilton and others that he and his troops were in confusion. In his defense he ridiculed Hamilton's hot declaration to him, on the field, that they must do or die; Hamilton was in "a sort of frenzy of valor."[47]

Aside from the story of "Molly Pitcher," a heroine of several names, but authentic,[48] mention of Monmouth calls to most minds excoriating language of Washington when he met Lee and countermanded the retreat, though the fact is doubtful. Hamilton was present, described the encounter to the court, and said

[46]*Ibid.*, pp. 66, 69-70, 72. Lee asked Hamilton, on the field, whether he, Lee, appeared to be self-possessed; he seems to have put the same anticipatory query to another officer that day (see Elias Boudinot, *Journal of Events in the Revolution,* p. 81), and he repeatedly sought answers from witnesses at the court martial on this point. Colonel Harrison, Washington's secretary, testified he heard Lee ask Hamilton, "Do I appear to have lost my senses, or do I appear to be out of my senses? or a question of that import." (*Court Martial,* p. 87; cf. Lee, *ibid.,* pp. 229-30.) Hamilton himself, the day following his evidence, wrote (to Lord Stirling as president of the court?) to correct a misimpression he may have given. Lee "asked me . . . 'Do I appear to you to have lost my senses, or do I not possess myself?' . . . so singular and unexpected a question was not a little embarrassing, and it is possible I . . . replied in terms of less reserve . . . than I should have done at a moment of . . . cooler reflection." Lee's answers were pertinent and he showed no personal fear, "But he . . . did not appear . . . to be in that collected state of mind . . . which is an essential requisite of *the General* . . . A certain indecision, improvidence, and hurry of spirits . . . were apparent. These were my thoughts at the time . . . " (Hamilton Papers, L.C., I, 123; this is Hamilton's original draft, marked in his hand, "Copied"; it is without date [July 14 surely] or address; printed in Lodge, *Works,* IX, 142-44).

[47]*Court Martial,* pp. 229-30; cf. Mercer's testimony, *ibid.,* p. 131. G. W. P. Custis, whose memory played him tricks, and who did not consult the record of the court-martial, said Hamilton made his sententious declarations not to Lee but to Washington. "During this interview . . . Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton . . . leaped from his horse, and, drawing his sword, addressed the general with—'We are betrayed; your excellency and the army are betrayed, and the moment has arrived when every true friend of America and her cause must be ready to die in their defence.' " (*Recollections,* p. 219.) This attack must have sharpened Hamilton's hostility toward Lee, and made agreeable his service as second in John Laurens' duel with the General, which see below.

[48]The evidence is reviewed in Stryker, *op. cit.,* pp. 188-92; cf. *Dictionary of American Biography,* XI, 574-75, under Mary McCauley.

nothing of angry words. Washington urged Lee to remain there and check advance of the enemy. Hamilton himself, much engaged in assisting Livingston and Olney to reform their troops for counterattack, was near Lee, but "heard no measures directed, nor saw any taken by him to answer the purpose . . . "[49]

The court martial found Lee guilty as charged on two counts—disobedience of orders in not attacking the enemy, and disrespect to the Commander-in-Chief—and substantially so on the third charge of an unnecessary retreat, though Washington's word "shameful" was omitted in the judgment. He was sentenced to suspension from any command in the army for twelve months,[50] which by many was thought too light for guilt, too heavy for censure.[51]

Lee's retreat at Monmouth, his ill-deserved letters to Washington, and his trial had *sequelae* in which Alexander Hamilton figured. Hamilton's friend and fellow-aide Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens was particularly resentful of Lee's expressions to

[49] *Court Martial,* p. 68. Lee told the court that when he expected "congratulation and applause," Washington accosted him "with the most disgraceful reproach" (*ibid.,* pp. 219, 233); the same resentment of "very singular expressions" opened Lee's first letter to Washington after the battle (Lee Papers, II, 435). Lafayette and Scott years later are said to have described abusive terms used by Washington to Lee (Stryker, *op. cit.,* pp. 180-81). Doubtful anyhow, these assertions are contradicted by Hamilton's answer, after Washington's death, to the question whether the Commander-in-Chief had cursed Lee: "Washington was modest. He was careful of his words. He had not time to curse. He had to retrieve the day." (John C. Hamilton, *History,* I, 476*n.*; no citation is given.) G. W. P. Custis, who, though not present, had means of knowing, was probably correct in calling it "a warm conversation" (*Recollections,* p. 219). Evidence as to whether Lee, after meeting Washington, busied himself with reversing the retreat is conflicting.

[50] *Court Martial,* p. 238.

[51] See, e.g., Henry Lee, *Memoirs of the War in the Southern Department of the United States,* p. 38. Congress, despite Lee's further expostulations, upheld the sentence (December 5, 1778, *Journals of the Continental Congress,* XII, 1195) and later dismissed Lee from the army permanently (January 10, 1780, *Journals,* XVI, 33). Lee's defence of his conduct at Monmouth was persevering, often vindictive against Washington and his other critics, and became more plausible, if not more truthful, with time (cf. *Court Martial,* p. 234; *Pennsylvania Packet,* December 3, 1778). His articulated plea was that he sought to draw the enemy through the three ravines toward the vantage ground on the heights where Washington launched the attack. Years later Hamilton said that Lee's retreating troops obeyed "the commands of a leader who meditated their disgrace." (Lodge, *Works,* VIII, 68; cf. Henry Laurens, Phila., July 6, 1778, to John Laurens, Lee Papers, II, 472-73.) Or was Boudinot's more charitable view of Lee also more accurate: " . . . whenever anything on a very large scale struck him . . . a partial Lunacy took place . . . " (*Journal of Events in the Revolution,* p. 81).

and about Washington. With doubtful propriety he passed on his anathemas to his father, Henry Laurens, then president of Congress, while the sentence of the court martial was pending before that body.[52] The younger Laurens applied to Hamilton from Philadelphia, probably December 5, 1778, to answer Lee's publications, especially his "Vindication" that had appeared two days before. With the help of material that could be supplied by "the ancient secretary" (Robert Hanson Harrison), said Laurens, Hamilton could conclusively show the inconsistency and falsity of Lee's defence.[53]

John Laurens with excessive zeal assumed the role of Washington's personal champion, and challenged Lee to a duel. Hamilton acted as Laurens' second, Major Evan Edwards as Lee's, when the principals met in a wood four miles south of Philadelphia on December 23. Lee received a slight wound in the side, and further shots were discountenanced by the seconds.[54]

Major John S. Eustace, formerly aide to Lee, more than a year after Monmouth sought a duel with Hamilton. In the presence of officers who would spread the word, he declared *"Colonel Hamilton was perjured*—that I could convince *himself* of it, by reading over the *Tryall to him* . . . " (Phila., August 24, 1779, Lee Papers, III, 363; cf. Mrs. Elizabeth Trist, Phila., October 25 [1779] to Lee confirming Eustace's charge against Hamilton, *ibid.*, pp. 381-82). In November, Eustace treated Hamilton with

[52]Lee Papers, II, 430.

[53]*Ibid.*, III, 273.

[54]See Lee, Phila., December 22, 1778, to John Laurens, accepting the challenge, proposing the spot in a wood near the four-mile stone on the Point-no-Point Road, and promising to appear "with a brace of pistols." He would willingly bring a small sword at the same time, "but from the effects of my fall (from a horse recently) and the quantity of Physick I have taken to baffle a fit of the Gout . . . I do not think myself sufficiently strong on my legs." (Lee Papers, III, 283.) Hamilton and Edwards jointly narrated, December 24, 1778 (Hamilton Papers, L.C., II, 137-38, printed in Lodge, *Works*, IX, 156-59), the honorable conduct of the combatants. According to agreement, they advanced on each other, firing at will. After Lee declared his wound was nothing, both were for second shots. Hamilton led in opposing this; Edwards agreed. In the conversation, Laurens said he came there because "General Lee had spoken of General Washington in the grossest . . . terms of personal abuse, which he . . . thought himself bound to resent as well on account of the relation he bore to General Washington, as from motives of . . . respect for his character." Lee answered that his strictures had been, andmight be a gain, on Washington's military character; he esteemed him as a man.

open discourtesy, had continued to spread his suspicions of Hamton's *"veracity on the tryall"* and expected a challenge from him (to Lee, Phila., November 28, 1779, *ibid.,* pp. 393-94). Apparently nothing came of this. A statement that Colonel Eleazer Oswald, who testified for Lee at the court martial, a decade later challenged Hamilton, but that the difficulties between them were explained away is given, without reference, in John Richard Alden, *General Charles Lee: Traitor or Patriot?* (p. 301); the present inquiry has found no confirmation of this. Hamilton's moral support to his friend Steuben in the Baron's challenge to Lee is shown in Hamilton's letter of December 19, 1778 (Lodge, Works, IX, 155-56). Lee in the trial cast aspersions on Steuben's courage at Monmouth (see Steuben, Phila., Dec. 2 [1778, to Lee]; Lee Papers, III, 253); the matter was accommodated. For Wayne's resentment of Lee's disparagement of *his* military conduct, which barely missed coming to a duel, see their correspondence of January 7, 1779, Lee Papers, *ibid.,* 291-92; at the time, Wayne was the guest at Elizabeth Town of Lieutenant Colonel Francis Barber, Hamilton's former teacher.

Mrs. Mary Treat, 1830 - 1923, Early New Jersey Naturalist

HARRY B. WEISS

MANY naturalists of the past, especially those interested in entomology, have received scanty recognition for their work if their contributions were made at a time when Benjamin D. Walsh, Charles V. Riley, Joseph A. Lintner, Asa Fitch, and Townend Glover were active. The output of these men was so great that others suffered by contrast. Mrs. Mary Treat was a gifted amateur, one whose interests lay in the fields of entomology, botany, and ornithology. Only her botanical papers have received recognition from botanists. As most of her writings were popular and appeared in popular magazines, many of her titles have not found their way into technical bibliographies.

My interest in Mrs. Treat was aroused some years ago, upon my reading *Fighting the Insects* (1933) by the late Dr. L. O. Howard, in which he said that he was encouraged to collect moths and butterflies when a child, by his mother and father and that when he was seven or eight years old, which would have been about 1865, his parents bought him a book called *The Butterfly Hunters,* by Mrs. Mary Treat. When Dr. Howard wrote *Fighting the Insects* he was around seventy-five and apparently his memory of happenings during his early childhood was not absolutely accurate. *The Butterfly Hunters* appeared in 1868 and it was written by Mrs. Helen Peters Conant and not by Mrs. Treat.

Mary (Allen) Treat was the daughter of Isaac M. and Eliza E. Davis. Her father was an itinerant Methodist minister. Mary was born September 7, 1830, in Trumansville, Tompkins County, New York. In 1839, when she was nine years old, her parents moved to Ohio where her adolescent years were spent in public schools, with a brief period later in a girls' academy. As a young woman she returned to New York State where she lived with a sister. On January 1, 1863, she married Dr. Joseph B. Treat, a

reformer who was vitally interested in the abolition movement and who, in addition to being a student of astronomy, was interested in nature and in his wife's studies of plant and insect life.

Mrs. Treat's husband was born in Windham, Ohio, November 8, 1823. His father, a Presbyterian clergyman,[1] intended him for the ministry and Joseph joined the church while a youth and engaged in Sunday School activities. After becoming convinced of the merits of the anti-slavery cause, he found that his father and most of the church were opposed. As a result he withdrew and entered the lecture field with the idea of liberating man from all forms of slavery. In addition he lectured upon scientific subjects.

Dr. Treat, who was educated at Windham Academy and who attended Western Reserve College but did not graduate owing to poor health, keenly enjoyed literary discussion. On July 29, 1860, he delivered an oration at the Paine celebration in Cincinnati, Ohio, on "God, Religion and Immortality" which occupied sixty-three printed pages. During the Civil War he served as a nurse. He was five feet ten-and-a-half inches tall and weighed 140 pounds.

The Treats moved to Vineland, New Jersey, in 1868 and it was here that most of Mrs. Treat's natural history observations were made. Vineland was a young developing town in those days, having been founded in 1861 by Charles K. Landis[2] whose idea was to make it a self-sufficient place in which to live with agricultural and industrial pursuits so balanced as to support each other.

[1]The Rev. Joseph Treat was born at New Milford, Connecticut, December 10, 1783, graduated from Yale 1810, and died at Windham, Ohio, May 9, 1841. Dr. Joseph Treat had a brother, Samuel W. In the editor's preface to *A Treatise on Some of the Insects Injurious to Vegetation,* by Thaddeus W. Harris (Boston, 1862), J. H. Treat and J. O. Treat are mentioned as having aided by presenting or lending specimens of insects for illustration and study. These men may have been part of the Treat family to which Dr. Joseph and his father belonged.

[2]With a capital of five hundred dollars in gold he purchased land, that was first surveyed and then laid out in streets. Then he obtained the help of a wealthy Philadelphia industrialist named Richard D. Wood and in time settlers from the Northwest and from New England seeking an even climate and a temperance atmosphere arrived in a steady stream. In 1865 more than one thousand acres of wild land were sold and over five hundred buildings were put up. In 1866 more than twelve hundred buildings were erected.

Mrs. Treat's entomological studies began soon after her settling in Vineland, because in 1869 we find her asking the editor of the *American Entomologist* for the identification of a savage, green beetle which she described. This turned out to be a species of *Calosoma.* In the November, 1869, issue of the *American Entomologist,* the editor stated "Mrs. Mary Treat of Vineland, New Jersey, sent us last June great numbers of newly hatched larvae of the bagworm and expressed a desire to learn something of their natural history." This was followed by a long account of the insect. In the May, 1870, number of the *American Entomologist and Botanist* snout beetles which Mrs. Treat had found in numbers were identified as specimens of *Hylobius confusus kirb.,* a species whose habits at that time were not well known, but it was said to be timber borer, usually found in pine trees.

From 1869 to 1880 ten articles and notes by Mrs. Treat, upon entomological subjects, appeared in the pages of the *American Entomologist* and its successors.[3] While Mrs. Treat was contributing her insect articles to this journal, her husband Joseph in 1868 was the author of a fifteen-page paper entitled "The Insect Extinguisher," and in addition he wrote a paper on "The Future of Vineland" that was printed during the same year. Dr. Treat also delivered a lecture on "Insect Pests" before the Vineland Agricultural and Horticultural Society in which he advised his hearers to carry all the toads they could find into the garden as they devoured immense quantities of insects. His lecture was noted in the July-August 1870 number of the *American Entomologist and Botanist.* Vineland must have been kept insect-conscious around that time because in the *Vineland Weekly* of May 15, 1869, Charles K. Landis said that he was convinced of the impossibility of successful fruit-raising in the Vineland community unless systematic and effective warfare was waged against insect enemies.

[3]This monthly entomological magazine made its appearance in 1868 with Benjamin D. Walsh as editor and Charles V. Riley as associate editor. Walsh died November 12, 1869, and Riley continued as editor. With the April, 1870, issue the name was changed to the *American Entomologist and Botanist* with George Vasey as the botanical editor. With the close of the second volume, the journal ceased publication. It was resurrected ten years later as the *American Entomologist,* new series, and twelve numbers were published in 1880.

To encourage such warfare he offered the following premiums, to be awarded under the auspices of the Agricultural Society:

> Ten dollars for the best half-acre of fruit trees kept the cleanest from tree grubs, curculios and apple moths; ten dollars each for the best acre, 2 acres, 4 acres, 5 acres, 6 acres, 7 acres, 8 acres, 9 acres and 10 acres, together with a Certificate of Merit, handsomely framed.

Mrs. Treat's insect observations appeared in such additional publications as the *American Naturalist, American Agriculturist, Harper's Magazine, Garden and Forest, Prairie Farmer,* and the *Journal of the New York Entomological Society*. In 1877, Harper and Bros. brought out her book, *Chapters on Ants,* and in 1880 her *Home Studies in Nature*. Orange Judd in 1882 published her work entitled *Injurious Insects of the Farm and Garden* and, in 1887, D. Lothrop Co., Boston, brought out her book, *My Garden Pets*. Her observations and publications covered a wide variety of insects. Many of these are specified in her bibliography. Her *Home Studies in Nature* includes material on common birds as well as on insects. When a second edition of this appeared in 1885, a favorable review was printed in the *Nation,*[4] complimenting Mrs. Treat for her contributions to natural history.

The late Dr. L. O. Howard, in his *History of Applied Entomology* (1930), referred to Mrs. Treat's *Injurious Insects of the Farm and Garden* as an attractive and useful compendium, largely compiled from the reports of Charles Valentine Riley and that of Comstock for 1879. He found after an examination of Mrs. Treat's text that it was largely in Riley's words and that whole pages had been copied from Riley's Missouri reports without quotation marks. However, in the preface Mrs. Treat stated that she had "largely availed herself" of Riley's writings. Perhaps she thought that this was a sufficient acknowledgement. Perhaps the quotation marks in her manuscript were edited out in the office of the publisher in view of the acknowledgement to Riley in the preface. It is too late now to find out. And it is not believed that the absence of quotation marks worried Mr. Riley. In fact Mr Treat treated Mr. Riley in the preface better than Mr. Riley

[4]Volume 41, p. 223.

treated his assistants. It was Riley's custom to put his name on much of the work of his assistants.[5]

Mrs. Treat carried on a voluminous correspondence with various scientific workers. Many letters on ants were exchanged from 1878 and 1880 between her and the Reverend Doctor Henry C. McCook, distinguished minister of Philadelphia and eminent student of spiders and ants. Charles V. Riley and Mrs. Treat wrote to each other about insects between 1869 and 1880. Foreign scientists were also within the reach of Mrs. Treat's letters. Dr. Auguste Forel of Switzerland named *Aphaenogaster treatae* in honor of Mrs. Treat, in 1886. This ant is distributed from Ontario south to Georgia and west to Nebraska and Texas. and Gustav L. Mayr of Vienna in 1881 named the cynipid oak fig root gall, found by Mrs. Treat on *Quercus virginiana* in Florida, *Belonocnema treatae*. It has been stated that C. V. Riley named insects after Mrs. Treat but I can not find any evidence in support of this.

At the 1883 meeting at Freehold, New Jersey, of the New Jersey State Horticultural Society the secretary read a paper by Mary Treat on insects injurious to fruits. Included were accounts of the pear slug, apple tree tent caterpillar, apple and peach tree borers, the red-humped caterpillar, bag-worms, and climbing cutworms.

From a comparison of Mrs. Treat's botanical and entomological titles, it would appear that her interest in plants overshadowed her interest in insects. Insectivorous plants claimed her attention early. In 1873 she published "Observations on the Sundew." With a co-worker in 1873 she found entomostraca in the traps of *Utricularia cleistogama*. In 1875 it was her belief that the animals opened the door and walked in. This was in agreement with

[5]In government circles at that time this policy was in common use. The chief of a unit published as his own the work of his assistants without credit. If the assistants never succeeded in getting administrative positions, they never had a chance to become identified with their own writings. When B. T. Galloway of the Federal Bureau of Plant Industry, according to a recent paper by John A. Stevenson, became an administrator he instituted a policy of giving full credit for all published material. C. V. Riley did not like this policy at all and when Galloway refused to change it, Riley made an issue of it by complaining to the Commissioner of Agriculture that such a procedure "cheapened the work and led to a lack of confidence in it on the part of the public which was not familiar with the names of the younger workers." After a hearing before the Commissioner, Galloway's new policy was approved.

Darwin and with Cohn that the prey entered by pushing in the door, which then closed, preventing escape. Francis E. Lloyd his book, *The Carnivorous Plants* (1942) states that in her 1876 paper Mrs. Treat revised her belief after finding that in *U. purpurea* the prey was engulfed suddenly as if drawn into a "partial vacuum." Although she did not know how the vacuum could be formed, her belief foreshadowed the discovery made in 1911 by Brocher, who observed that "on stimulation the walls of the trap expand, drawing in water in the capture of prey" (Lloyd).

Through correspondence with Dr. Asa Gray, Mrs. Treat found that Charles Darwin was making similar studies. In fact F. Cohn, Mrs. Treat, and Darwin were, at the same time, independently reaching similar conclusions. Mrs. Treat stated that the larvae were digested in the course of forty-eight hours. "I was forced to the conclusion that these little bladders are in truth like so many stomachs, digesting and assimilating animal food."

Mrs. Treat carried on an extensive correspondence with Charles Darwin and in his book on *Insectivorous Plants* (1875) he made several references to Mrs. Treat's researches. Writing of *Utricularia clandestina* he said, "Mrs. Treat of New Jersey has been more successful than any other observer." He complimented her habit of careful observation by writing, "Perhaps the blades of vigorous plants would bend over captured insects and Dr. Canby informs me that this is the case; but the movement cannot be strongly pronounced, as it was not observed by Mrs. Treat."[6] Dr. John W. Harshberger in 1899 wrote that "the results of her researches in regard to the structure and habits of *Drosera, Dionaea, Pinguicula, Sarracenia,* and especially of *Utricularia* have been valuable additions to science." Harshberger also noted that in her *Home Studies in Nature* she criticised Darwin's statement of the way in which *Utricularis* entrapped its victims, to which Darwin answered: "It is pretty clear that I am quite wrong."

In his book *The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work,* Dr. Harshberger paid enthusiastic tribute to Mrs. Treat for her studies of the flora of New Jersey, and Florida. Mrs. Treat visited Florida during the winters of 1876, 1877, and 1878 in order to study insectivorous plants. From 1888 to 1897 she wrote forty-one

[6] *Insectivorous Plants,* p. 281.

botanical papers for *Garden and Forest,* most of these being popular accounts of the flora of the New Jersey Pine Barrens in the vicinity of Vineland at different seasons of the year. In his work, *The Vegetation of the New Jersey Pine-Barrens,* Dr. Harshberger reset many of her facts in botanic phraseology.

Writing under the title "Autumn Color in the Pines" in 1895, Mrs. Treat said:

> The autumn color of the pine-barrens varies from season to season. Some years the swamp maples are a blaze of red. The shrubs, too, make brilliant masses of color, especially those of the heath family. The Vacciniums are purple, crimson, and scarlet; Andromedas gleam through various shades of red to a bronze-purple, while the varied shades of red in Leucothoe mingle with the yellow of Clethra and Azalea viscosa. The fruit of black alder shines brightly red among its greenish-yellow leaves and contrasts well with the red-brown foliage of Alnus serrulata near by.
>
> Very handsome, too, are the cranberries, trailing through the sphagnum, with purple and green leaves and scarlet and crimson fruit. Different species of Smilax are clambering everywhere, mantling dead trees and every other unsightly object, and all this wealth of color mingled with the green of the pines, cedars, and laurel.

And under the caption "Christmas in the Pines," Mrs. Treat wrote with aptness:

> The Pines just now remind one of Florida rather than of New Jersey. I never remember to have seen as much freshness in a ramble here at Christmas time as now appears, and I can hardly realize that these are winter days. The foliage is so green and the berries so bright and plump that it is difficult to associate them with shrivelling frosts. Not a flake of snow has fallen, and many warm rains have served to keep up the illusion that somehow this is a belated section of summer. The woods are always fragrant, but now they do not exhale the rich odor of fallen leaves, but the subtle, living aroma of growing pine trees, and the spice of shrubs and herb, which is always so refreshing.

In the *Annual Report of the New Jersey State Museum, Including a Report of the Plants of Southern New Jersey, with Especial Reference to the Flora of the Pine Barrens* (1910) by Witmer Stone, Mrs. Treat's contributions to a knowledge of the Pine Barren flora are set forth but Stone, who was somewhat critical of inaccuracies in popular accounts, wrote:

> These short sketches are marred by a certain amount of error in identification and by a lack of clearness as to just which plants are wild and

which are growing in a wild garden, transplanted from elsewhere.

Such plants, also, as *Thuja occidentalis, Dalibarda repens, Coreopsis grandiflora, Gerardia auriculata, Smilax tamnoides* and *Nyssa aquatica* are casually mentioned as familiar Pine Barren species, none of which are known from the region. Certain other species are referred to in a way that would lead one to think they occurred near Vineland, while, in reality, they are found only on the coast or in West Jersey, not in the Pines.

During one of the three winters that Mrs. Treat spent in Florida she discovered a species of Zephyr-lily, that was named *Zephyranthes treatae* (Family *Amaryllidaceae*) by Professor S. Watson of Harvard. During another of her voyages on the St. Johns River in Florida she ran her canoe into an unfrequented spot and rediscovered a yellow water lily that was supposed to have become extinct, being known only from a description in early books on botany. This delighted Dr. Asa Gray of Harvard.[7]

Mrs. Treat's natural history interests did not stop with botany and entomology but included ornithology also. As early in her writing career as 1870 she was paid twelve dollars by *Hearth and Home* for her manuscript "Notes on Birds." As may be noted from her bibliography, thirteen titles of her bird writings have been collected.[8] These were written between 1870 and 1896.

Mrs. Treat was also a student of the animalculae found in swamp water and these were studied by her under the microscope. Her joint authorship with Samuel Wells of *Through a Microscope* is evidence of her interest in such organisms.

[7]The Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society possesses quite a collection of letters written to Mrs. Treat, including some from Asa Gray. One of these written from the Herbarium of Harvard University, Botanic Garden, Cambridge, Massachusetts is quoted:

Dear Mrs. Treat,

You will hardly credit it—that I have had Darwin's book for a fortnight and I have not yet found time to read over 20 or 30 pages.

That shows you how busy I am, and with *much less* interesting work—but work that is both necessary and pressing.

Go ahead with your delightful work, and publish the results.

Ever Yours truly

A. Gray

[8]It has been difficult to assemble such titles because her bird papers were published in popular magazines and the titles rarely found their way into ornithological bibliographies. And as they were published principally in the 1870's and 1880's, before most of the guides to periodical literature were started, they cannot be found in such indices. Mrs. Treat's papers dealt with our common birds for which she was paid sums ranging from ten to fifty dollars.

In addition to the correspondents who have been mentioned, Mrs. Treat's list included W. A. Stiles of *Garden and Forest;* Dr. Herbert M. Denslow, botanist and contributor to botanical journals; the Rev. J. G. Morris, Lutheran clergyman and lepidopterist of Baltimore, Maryland, who also visited her home; Benjamin D. Walsh, the entomologist of Illinois; and Dr. F. W. Goding, late authority on the Membracidae, who wrote to Mrs. Treat on January 5, 1885, stating his intention of writing *Biographies of Eminent Economic Entomologists of North America* to be issued in book form during 1885.[9] There were also Professor Charles S. Sargent, one-time director of the Arnold Arboretum, Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts; Dr. Theodore L. Flood, farmer Methodist minister and one of the editors of *The Chautauquan,* who at one time asked Mrs. Treat for "about a thousand words on 'A Wild Garden' making it inspiring enough so that every woman who reads your article will want one, and practical enough so that she will know how to go to work to make it"; and George Thurber of the *American Agriculturist* and of *Hearth and Home,* who wrote on March 17, 1873, "In your last you said 'But oh these Men!' and I fear that I have given you occasion to say so several times since."

When Mrs. and Dr. Treat first came to Vineland in 1868, from Mays Landing, they lived at Sixth and Plum streets, then in 1871 on Landis Avenue above Seventh Street. After the death of her husband which took place in New York City on February 7, 1878 (Feb. 5, 1879, according to some accounts), Mrs. Treat occupied the eastern half of a double house on the north side of Park Avenue owned by C. B. Campbell.[10] The Campbells lived in the western half and Mrs. Phebe T. W. Campbell illustrated many of Mrs. Treat's writings. While in this house Mrs. Treat planted a circle of arbor vitae trees having a diameter of one hundred feet. It was within this circular arbor vitae hedge that Mrs. Treat established her "insect menagerie," and observed the behavior of various insects and spiders.

Mrs. Treat's permanent home was on the south side of Park

[9]This work, planned for an illustrated edition of one hundred copies, to be priced at two dollars, never appeared. Dr. Goding, however, did write several accounts of entomologists that were published in entomological journals.

[10]Later sold to the Floods.

Avenue across from the Campbells and it was there that she planted trees and shrubs, remodelled her house, and ornamented her grounds, living quietly and with dignity. Mrs. Treat called her home "The Cedars,"[11]

In 1887 H. R. Meredith wrote the following descriptive verses about Mrs. Treat's home.

THE CEDARS

There's a Home where are trailing vines and flowers,
And trees where the birds find leafy bowers
And sing in the branches, and freely come
To bathe in the fountains for them prepared.
Their joy is a joy by their Hostess shared
In her Rural Home.

Ye birds, winged travelers of the air,
What are your songs that rise like prayer?
Would they your joyous thoughts declare?
They sound so sweet and free from care
Amid the Cedars.

Response

We praise the sweet Donor
For all our great honor
And kind loving care.

From felines defended,
And so much befriended
By sympathy rare.

For the fountains and quiet,
Exempt from all riot
Of our enemies.

For her we'll sing sweetly,
And love her completely.
For blessings like these
We'll sing in the Cedars, Her praise.

Mrs. Annie M. Lane (nee Annie Jones), late Tuller, who when a school girl first met Mrs. Treat, wrote many years later of her

[11]It was built after a curious plan of Joseph W. Mason who came to Vineland in 1863. He sold it to Mrs. Treat who enlarged it, and many years later she sold it to Mrs. Frank Channon (Lenora Flood) by whom it was again remodelled. It is now known as 1017 Park Avenue and is owned by Mrs. Joseph Lolli.

humility, her modesty and unostentatious manner. Mrs. Treat's reserve made a deep impression upon Mrs. Lane. For about five minutes after one called upon Mrs. Treat, one would wonder if a mistake had been made, if the hour was wrong, if Mrs. Treat really was interested in meeting anyone. But the reserve soon wore off, her conversation became freer, and her manner more friendly. She enjoyed a good laugh and appreciated the funny side of human nature. But her reticence during the first five minutes was a general occurrence. Mrs. Lane wrote that Mrs. Treat's generosity was boundless and no one left her dwelling without some of the rare and beautiful flowers that grew in wild profusion in her garden. She believed that Mrs. Treat found that "All the happiness in living, Comes from loving and from giving."

Mr. Henry W. Wilbur, writing about Mrs. Treat's fame as a naturalist in the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* of October 5, 1913, said that although Mrs. Treat had lived in Vineland forty-five years, she had been so modest and retiring that only a few residents of the town knew of her activities and writings. She was never robust, being five feet tall and weighing 110 pounds. At eighty-three she was bright and cheery and well preserved, with a gentle and gracious personality. In addition to the magazines that have been mentioned, she was a contributor to *St. Nicholas* and at one time visited California. Her books yielded royalties and Mr. Wilbur considered that she had been a success economically and scientifically. An accidental fall crippled her and she was forced to curtail her activities. A long illness followed during which she was cared for by her sister Mrs. Nellie Brown. As her age increased so did her infirmities. Eventually her Vineland home was disposed of and her sister took her back to Akron, New York, where she could be more comfortable among relatives and where she spent the balance of her life. She died on April 11, 1923, in her ninety-third year. Her remains were buried in Siloam Cemetery, Vineland, where her husband was also interred.

When Mrs. Treat was sixty-three years old she wrote as follows to Mrs. Horace Tuller (nee Annie Jones, but later Mrs. Charles Lane), as follows.

Vineland, N. J.
April 19, 1893

My dear Mrs. Tuller:

How would you like to start a young Ladies Club—an informal affair without officers or any special regulations—to meet with me every two weeks to discuss topics on Botany or Entomology or Ornithology, or to read anything one had to offer, either original or selected. To me it would be a real boon to have the young people around me to laugh and chat and have a plain tea, so no one need hurry home until the cool of the evening.

I am enlarging my house and hope to be settled by the first of May in time for many of our most charming wild flowers which we might like to learn more about.

I have some three or four young ladies in mind who I would like to meet with us—Miss McGeorge and Miss Braidwood—both artists and flower lovers, and the two Miss Knights who live near me.

I think about ten or a dozen would be a convenient number—those of kindred tastes, and I will leave you to choose among your friends those whom you would like to form the Club.

Let me hear from you either personally or by letter what you think of the plan, and then we can come to a more definite arrangement.

Sincerely yours
Mary Treat

The writings of Mrs. Treat upon insects and plants are essentially sound. She was a patient and careful observer who was recognized as such by her contemporaries. Although much of her work was published in popular magazines, as technical journals were scarce during her time, above all she was interested in accuracy and this was not sacrificed for popularity. She also had a talent for writing pleasing, descriptive prose. And although her incentive was chiefly a love of nature and the fun of making discoveries, her activities resulted also in some financial rewards. Although neglected heretofore by natural history biographers Mrs. Treat deserves a place in the history of New Jersey's natural history as its first capable woman naturalist.[12]

[12]*Acknowledgements*: I am greatly indebted to Miss Elena J. Darling, secretary of the Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society for her invaluable help in supplying information about Mrs. Treat from the papers of the Society. I also wish to acknowledge the helpful assistance of Dr. Luther B. Arrington, agricultural librarian, Rutgers University; Dr. William H. Stickel, Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Department of the Interior; Louise O. Bercaw, chief, Division of Reference and Lending Services, United States Department of Agriculture Library; Dr. W. L. McAtee, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; and Gloria Clark of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MARY TREAT

Entomological and Related Writings

1869. Polyphemus Moth. *Amer. Ent.,* Dec. 1869-Jan. 1870, Vol. 2, No. 3. Transformation of *Telea polyphemus.*

1869. The Tomato Worm. *Amer. Ent.,* Dec. 1869-Jan. 1870, Vol. 2, No. 3. Food plants of Sphinx 5-maculata-Protoparce celeus.

1869. White Grub Fungus. *Amer. Ent.,* Nov. 1869, Vol. 2, p. 25. Abundance, color.

1869. Parasitic Mites on the House Fly. *Amer. Ent.,* Dec. 1869-Jan. 1870, Vol. 2, No. 3. Notes on occurrence and transference.

1870. Plant Lice and Their Enemies. *Amer. Ent.,* March 1870, Vol. 2, pp. 141-43. Habits of several plant lice enemies.

1870. My Raspberry and Verbena Moths and What Came of Them. *Amer. Ent. and Bot.,* May 1870, Vol. 2, pp. 203-05, figs. Life history and habits of *Synchlora rubivora* and of *Penthina hebesana.*

1870. Pupa of the Girdled Sphinx. *Amer. Ent. and Bot.,* June 1870, Vol. 2, p. 41. Characters of larva and pupa of *Protoparce cingulata.*

1870. To Kill the Pea Weevil. *Amer. Ent. and Bot.,* June 1870, Vol. 2, p. 41. Use of boiling water against *Bruchus pisi.*

1874. The Enemies of the Oak. *Amer. Agric.,* Sept. 1874, Vol. 33, p. 344, figs. 1-5. Character and ravages of *Prionus laticollis, Cossus robiniae, Dryocampa senatoria,* and of the oak pruner *Elaphidion villosum.*

1877. *Chapters on Ants.* ("Harper's Half Hour Series.") New York: Harper and Bros., 1877, 96 pp. Another edition, 1879.

1878. The Harvesting Ants of Florida. *Harper's New Monthly Mag.,* Nov. 1878.

1879. Notes on the Slave-Making Ant (F. Sanguinea). *Amer. Nat.,* Vol. 13, pp. 707-08.

1879. A Chapter in the History of Ants. *Harper's New Monthly Mag.,* Jan. 1879, pp. 176-84.

1880. Notes on Harvesting Ants in New Jersey. *Amer. Ent.,* Vol. 3 (N.S., Vol. 1), pp. 225-26. Characters and habits.

1880. *Home Studies in Nature,* New York, 1880. 2 pts., illus. From *Harper's Magazine,* Vol. 60, pp. 710-18, 857-62. This book, which includes material about common birds as well as insects, was published again in 1885, by Harper and Bros., 243 pp.

1882. *Injurious Insects of the Farm and Garden.* New York: Orange Judd, 1882. 288 pp., 163 figs. Insects injurious to garden vegetables, root crops, corn, cereal grains, grass crops, fruit trees, small fruits, flower garden, greenhouse. Rocky Mountain lo-

Mrs. Mary Treat and her husband, Dr. Joseph B. Treat. (Courtesy of the Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society.)

cust. Second edition appeared in 1899, with an added chapter on beneficial insects.

1886. *Through a Microscope; Something of the Science, Together with Many Curious Observations Indoor and Out and Directions for a Home-Made Microscope. By Samuel Wells, Mary Treat and Frederick Leroy Sargent.* Chicago, Boston: The Interstate Publishing Company [1886]. 126 pp., incl. illus., plates. Library of Congress.

1887. *My Garden Pets.* Boston: D. Lothrop Co., 1887. 144 pp.

1887. Argiope Riparia Var. Multiconcha. Phila., 1887. 1 p. Extracted from *Amer. Nat.,* Dec. 1887.

1888. Curculio and Injury to Cherries. *Prairie Farmer,* Aug. 18, 1888, p. 538.

1891. The Pines at Christmas-Time. *Garden and Forest,* pp. 62-63. Notes on *Lophyrus abbotii* and *Retinia frustana.*

1891. Insect Enemies of the Pitch Pine. *Garden and Forest,* pp. 62-63. Notes on *Tomicus calligraphus, Chalcophora virginiensis, C. liberta* and *Monohammus confusor.*

1893. Some Injurious Insects of the Orchard and Garden. *Jour. N.Y. Ent. Soc.,* pp. 16-20. Treats of *Saperda bivittata, Carpocapsa pomonella, Clisiocampa americana, Aegeria exitiosa* and *Macrodactylus subspinosus.*

Botanical Writings

1870. Pine Barren Plants. *Amer. Ent. and Bot.,* Sept. 1870, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 318-19.

1873. Observations on the Sundew. *Amer. Nat.,* Vol. 7, pp. 705-08.

1875. Plants That Eat Animals. *N.Y. Daily Tribune,* Feb. 1, 1875. Reprinted without illustrations in *Gardeners' Chronicle,* March 6, 1875, pp. 303-04.

1876. Is the Valve of Utricularia Sensitive? *Harper's New Monthly Magazine.* Vol. 52, pp. 382-87.

1888. The Pines in July. *Garden and Forest,* Vol. 1, pp. 290-91.

1890+ The following popular accounts of the Pine Barren flora around Vineland at different seasons appeared in *Garden and Forest,* 1890-97:

Botanical Names. Vol. 3, p. 206.
The Wild Garden. *Ibid.,* p. 442.
September in the Pines. *Ibid.,* p. 463.
October in the Pines. *Ibid.,* p. 524.
Ornamental Fruits in the Pines. *Ibid.,* p. 534.
Evergreens in the New Jersey Pine Region. *Ibid.,* p. 546.
The Pines at Christmas Time. Vol. 4, p. 14.
Insect Enemies of the Pitch Pine. *Ibid.,* p. 62.

How to Make a Wild Garden. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
Notes from a Wild Garden. *Ibid.*, p. 351.
Spring in the New Jersey Pines. Vol. 5, p. 220.
Weeds in Southern New Jersey. *Ibid.*, p. 292.
Water-Plants in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 400.
Edible Fruits in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 435.
Late Autumn in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 567.
Native Plants for Winter Decoration. Vol. 6, p. 141.
Summer in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 314.
Late Summer in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 382.
The Pines in October. *Ibid.*, p. 443.
Winter-Blooming Plants in the Pines. Vol. 7, p. 102.
March in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
A New Jersey Garden in Spring. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
Early June in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
Wayside Plants in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 302.
November in a New Jersey Garden. *Ibid.*, p. 458.
Late Autumn in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 482.
Christmas in the Pines. Vol. 8, p. 3.
Troublesome Grasses in Southern New Jersey. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
In the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
Early Summer in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 262.
The Pines in a Dry Summer. *Ibid.*, p. 362.
Autumn Color in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 452.
The Heaths among the Pines in Early Winter. *Ibid.*, p. 492.
Spring in the Pines. Vol. 9, p. 173.
The Pines in August. *Ibid.*, p. 332.
Early Autumn in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 412.
Climbing Plants in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 492.
Weeds in Southern New Jersey. Vol. 10, p. 313.
Cruelty of Asclepias. *Ibid.*, p. 341.
Autumn Flowers in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 411.
Autumn Fruits in the Pines. *Ibid.*, p. 471.

Ornithological Writings[13]

Notes on Birds. *Hearth and Home.* Paid $12.00, July 5, 1870.
Freaks of Birds. *Hearth and Home.* Paid $7.00, Dec. 4, 1871.
Do Birds Improve as Architects? *Harper's Magazine,* Vol. 51 (1875), pp. 127-30. Paid $20.00, July 28, 1874.

[13]In this list, the amounts paid Mrs. Treat have been included, together with the dates they were paid, in order to supply the approximate time the articles were published. It is believed that payment was made upon acceptance of the articles and previous to publication. These titles were supplied principally by Miss Elena J. Darling, secretary, Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society, who examined the letters from Mrs. Treat's publishers.

Our Familiar Birds. *Harper's Magazine.* Paid $50.00, Dec. 26, 1876.
Our Mocking Bird. *Forest and Stream,* March 1877, Vol. 8, pp. 112-13.
Notes on the Intelligence of Birds. *Lippincott's Magazine,* Sept. 1879, Vol. 24, pp. 359-64.
Notes on Birds. *Lippincott's.* Paid $25.00, Aug. 16, 1879.
Home Observations on Birds. *Harper's.* Paid $10.00, Sept. 11, 1880.
The Great-Crested Flycatcher. *Amer. Nat.,* Vol. 15 (1881), pp. 601-04.
Our Winter Birds. *Atlantic Monthly.* Paid $25.00, March 1, 1882.
Our Cuckoos and Cowbirds. *Youth's Companion.* Paid $10.00, April 19, 1887 or 1889.
Winter Birds in the Pines. *Garden and Forest,* Jan. 1893, Vol. 6, p. 39.
Autumn Birds in the Pines. *Garden and Forest,* Nov. 11, 1896, Vol. 9, p. 452.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon. "Literary Vineland." *Vineland Historical Magazine,* Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 121-22. About Dr. and Mrs. Treat.
Harshberger, John W. *The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work.* Philadelphia, 1899.
———. *The Vegetation of the New Jersey Pine-Barrens.* 1916.
Howard, L. O. *A History of Applied Entomology.* Washington, D.C., 1930.
———. *Fighting the Insects.* New York, 1933.
Landis, Charles K. "Insect Extermination." *Amer. Ent.,* Vol. 1, No. 11, July, 1869.
Lloyd, Francis Ernest. *The Carnivorous Plants.* Waltham, Mass., 1942.
Stevenson, John A. "Plants, Problems, and Personalities: the Genesis of the Bureau of Plant Industry." *Agric. Hist.,* Vol. 28, pp. 155-62, Oct., 1954.
Stone, Witmer. *Report of the Plants of Southern New Jersey, with Especial Reference to the Flora of the Pine Barrens.* (Annual Report, New Jersey State Museum, 1910.)
Wilbur, Henry W. "World's Most Famous and Industrious Woman Naturalist [Mary Treat]." *Philadelphia Public Ledger,* Oct. 5, 1913.

Walt Whitman and the Camden Circle

HENRY CHUPACK

In a year which is celebrating the centennial anniversary of the publication of the first edition of the *Leaves of Grass,* and which has already seen the publication of a critical biography of Walt Whitman,[1] together with a play dealing with the poet's early life including his service on the now defunct *Brooklyn Eagle,*[2] it may be interesting to review those aspects of the poet's life and work which made possible his contemporary fame.

At present Whitman is considered the greatest poet America has so far produced; this is not the status he always enjoyed. To be sure, Whitman became known to the literary world as early as 1855 when the *Leaves* first appeared. With the publication the following year of Emerson's letter congratulating him "on the beginning of a great career" Whitman was fairly launched in his role as the poet of American life and democracy. Yet the acceptance of his fellow countrymen which he so eagerly sought, was denied him despite the deepening strain evident in those poems dealing with the Civil War and its aftermath In fact notoriety rather than fame seemed destined to be the poet's lot as a result of the Harlan episode, which saw the poet dismissed from his clerkship in Washington on charges of immorality in his work. Thus a bleak future appeared to be the fate of him whose "foothold [was] mortis'd and tenon'd in granite, [who could] laugh at what you called dissolution, [because he knew] the amplitude of time." A paralytic stroke in 1865 brought on in part by his work as a nurse during the war further hindered Whitman from

THE WRITER, holder of a Ph.D. in English from New York University, 1952, has taught English and social studies in the New York high school system for the past eight years. "I am particularly interested in Americana, [and feel] . . . a deep appreciation of our country's way of life will insure its perpetuation. To foster this idea, I am desirous of seeing a magazine started which will do for American literature and its literary past what Bruce Catton's *American Heritage* is doing for our country's historical past."

[1]Gay Wilson Allen, *Walt Whitman: the Solitary Singer* (New York, 1955).
[2]Randolph Goodman, *I, Walt Whitman* (Brooklyn, 1955).

pushing himself into the literary spotlight. When in 1873 he visited Camden to be near his dying mother, Whitman's popularity was literally at its lowest point.

However, a Whitman scholar recently has stated that by 1876 the poet's literary reputation was so solidly established[3] that friends of his, like William O'Connor and John Burroughs, had no need of cudgeling those critics who were still taking the poet to task for his blatant egotism, the lack of organization in his poetry and for the unrestricted manner in which he had written of sex. Facts show Professor Willard's assertion to be wrong. An editorial written by Bayard Taylor in the New York *Tribune,*[4] denouncing the English subscribers to the 1876 edition of the *Leaves,* revealed how lightly the poet was regarded by the genteel critics of the Gilded Age.

Yet it was during his years in Camden, especially the last eight years of his life when Whitman lived in a small house of his own at 328 Mickle Street, that the groundwork was being laid for the future acceptance of the poet and of his work, and which helps explain the present popularity his prose and poetry are enjoying. For lovers of Whitman's work and others interested in the poet's last days, Camden this year will be the goal of many a pilgrimage, and in order to better appreciate their visit, the more imaginative should try to envision the little gray shingled house which they are visiting as it was lived in during the last decade and a half of the nineteenth century. The neatly arranged parlor into which they will step first as they leave the narrow hallway, they must try to visualize as a wholly untidy room in which books, newspapers, manuscripts, trunks, and other like materials were strewn around the floor, often making it difficult for visitors to find a place to sit. The quietness they will experience, once inside the house, they must discount as false and think instead of the many, many visitors who visited Whitman night and day, and of the resultant conversations. Last, they must try to picture a venerable-looking old man, almost prophet-like in appearance with his snowy beard and majestic mien and manner, seated in his parlor chair near the front window, and then they will get a

[3]Charles B. Willard, *Whitman's American Fame* (Providence, R.I., 1950), p. 25.
[4]New York *Tribune,* March 10, 1876.

faint idea of the tremendous personality who lived in this house and thus better appreciate the significance of their pilgrimage.

For it was the force behind this man's personality which made possible the growth of a circle of warm admirers, some wholeheartedly dedicated to the poet's welfare, a resolution aided by their residence close by in Camden or Philadelphia; others, no less devoted to Whitman's good, whether financially or literarily, even though they lived in Boston, New York, or Washington, D.C. Yet to understand how this circle of devoted friends and admirers grew, one must appreciate the circumstances which surrounded Whitman's coming to Camden and insured his sojourn there until his death. Actually Whitman never really intended to stay in the city in which his beloved mother had died; however, a second paralytic stroke he suffered in 1873 made compulsory his stay in the city where he lived at his brother's, Colonel George Whitman's house, at 431 Stevens Street.[5] There until 1884 when he was financially able to buy his own home, Whitman followed a daily routine which he eventually pursued in Mickle Street until illness prevented him from doing so Living in a household with his brother George, a pipe inspector who was not interested in poetry, Walt got along well with his sister-in-law Louisa, who fed him his breakfasts after a usually late rising and a leisurely morning bath on his part.

When the weather was pleasant, Whitman would dress himself carefully in the gray suit which had become his sartorial trademark, and take ferry rides across the Delaware River to Philadelphia, rides which constituted his greatest pleasure when he was able to enjoy them. In Philadelphia he would go to the Mercantile Library on Tenth Street, where he read assiduously "the newspapers from everywhere." When tired of this activity, he would take rides on the Market Street trolley cars, on which he struck up the same sense of camaraderie with the drivers and conductors that he had enjoyed with the bus drivers in New York before the Civil War.

[5]The Colonel George Whitmans lived for a short while at 322 Stevens Street, where Walt occupied two rooms on the top floor. Seeing a better situation for his family at 431, Colonel George moved his household there. Besides Walt, another brother, a forty-year-old imbecile, Eddie, was staying with the family. Later Eddie was removed to an institution in Moorestown where Walt and Colonel George both contributed equally to his upkeep.

But Walt was not happy. Though cared for by his brother and sister-in-law, and apparently occupied with his newspapers at home and at the Mercantile Library Reading Room, or with rides on the ferries and street cars, Whitman was psychically wounded, deeply worried, and filled with a sense of frustration during these early years in Camden. His mother's death still bothered him, and he was also worried by the fact that he would never be well enough to earn a livelihood, thus having to depend on his brother George. What bothered him most, though, was that he had failed in his mission as the poet of his country. Letters to friends like Burroughs, Mrs. William O'Connor, and especially to Pete Doyle, a young street-car conductor whom he had known quite well in Washington, are filled with the disappointments Whitman was nursing. Literarily, this battle with a sense of defeat and frustration was beautifully summarized in "Prayer of Columbus" composed at this time. Identifying himself with the "battered wrecked old man," the poet pledged himself to make "one effort more" to work and scorn adversity.

Desirous of putting his new resolve into action, Whitman became acquainted with Henry L. Bonsall, the proprietor of a Camden weekly, *The New Republic,* and had his "Song of the Universal" published in June, 1874. Later Bonsall became the publisher of the Camden *Post,* a daily newspaper whose pages remained open to the poet, a privilege of which Whitman was to make much use, inserting many articles telling of his various activities.

A poem written in 1874, "An Old Man's Thought of School," written for the opening of the new Cooper school built at Third and Linden streets, indicates that the poet had become well-enough known to the local school officials to be entrusted with the task.

Visits from friends like Burroughs, and some of Burroughs' friends, such as Eldridge and J. B. Marvin during these early years tended to fend off the ennui and boredom which his enforced inactivity brought in its wake. A visit from Lord Houghton in November, 1875, was to be the first of many visits Britishers, both men and women, made during these years.

An article Whitman wrote for the January 26, 1876, issue of

the *West Jersey Press,* a weekly, entitled "Walt Whitman's Actual American Position," was to have reverberations far beyond anything the poet must have visualized when he sat down to reply to an estimate of his reputation among American critics which had appeared in the Springfield *Republican.* When the article was reprinted soon afterwards in the London *Athenaeum,* it caused Robert Buchanan, an English admirer, to write a letter to the London *Daily News* on March 13. Blasting American critics and publishers for their neglect of the Camden bard, Buchanan's letter set off a charge that detonated clear across the Atlantic. While the letter enlisted the aid of Whitman's English friends, it also brought down on Buchanan's head as well as on the poet's, the vituperation and wrath of those American reviewers who felt the Englishman's charges against the American literati were unjust. It was at this time that Taylor wrote his editorial in the *Tribune,* which Burroughs and O'Connor felt impelled to answer in the newspaper columns.

Uplifted in purse and in mind as the result of the sale of the Centennial edition of the *Leaves,* a direct result of the Buchanan letter, Whitman now entered a new phase of activity which more than any other did most to rebuild his partly paralyzed body and restore his spirit. He was to visit the Stafford farm, about ten miles outside of Camden and there get the uplift and inspiration which nature afforded. There on the farm, on the edge of Timber Creek, through repeated mud and sun baths and physical exercises, the poet regained a sense of confidence in his bodily movements which had been somewhat shattered as a result of the strokes of 1865 and 1873. With the loving ministrations of Mrs. Stafford and her children, Whitman soon made himself at home on the farm and it environs, making lasting impressions on the family and the people who lived nearby.[6]

In the contented state of mind the Stafford farm afforded, Whitman soon began writing the perceptive nature sketches that later appeared in *Specimen Days and Collect,* published in 1882. The happiness and restored sense of health which visits to Stafford farm gave Whitman continued for more than a decade; here

[6]John Rowan, a hired man at the Stafford farm, had this to say: "You could never forget Mr. Walt Whitman's smile and I came to look for it after that."

such notable English visitors as Edward Carpenter and Mrs. Anne Gilchrist came to see him; here he came to terms with what he thought was most important in life,[7] namely Nature.

With Whitman's daily routine now fairly set, the pre-Mickle Street years became more eventful with various visitors coming to see him from England. The Gilchrist family came to Philadelphia in September, 1876, ostensibly to have one of its members, the oldest daughter, Beatrice, attend a medical school; in truth the family had crossed the Atlantic because the mother Anne Gilchrist, the widow of William Blake's biographer, Alexander Gilchrist, was ready to marry Whitman if he would have her! Having read the *Leaves* in 1869 and interpreting his lines as a call for a soul to love in return for the love he had given to the world through his verse, Mrs. Gilchrist had already published "A Woman's Estimate of Walt Whitman" in 1870, the first important feminine defense of Whitman's poetry in print. Realizing this able woman's serious state of mind in regard to him, Whitman, with whom Anne had already started a correspondence, did everything he could in his letters to make her desist from coming to America, informing her that her ideal conception of him might not square with the actual reality.

Once she arrived, Whitman resigned himself to the situation and made many tea-supper visits to 1929 North Twenty-second Street where Anne had rented a home during her Philadelphia stay. Especially ingratiating himself with the children, Grace and Herbert, Whitman was the soul of dignity dressed in a complete suit of gray, with a spotlessly white linen collar open at the throat, which his beard covered. As he discussed the English and French writers of the day, indicating his great admiration of George Sand among the French "litterateurs," Mrs. Gilchrist, now thoroughly aware of Walt's infirmity, abandoned her previous idea of marriage, but did not let this physical defect impinge upon a solid friendship which now grew stronger as the hope of marriage receded.

Whitman considered Anne Gilchrist his "noblest woman

[7] "After you have exhausted what there is in business, politics, conviviality, love, and soon have found that none of these satisfy, or permanently wear, what remains? Nature remains." *Complete Writing of Walt Whitman,* IV, 143-44.

friend" and upon her death in 1885 wrote "Going Somewhere," a poem in which he shared Anne's idea that death was not the be-all and end-all of existence. She too, like Walt, had conceived of the universe as indestructible and continuous, and therefore she was going somewhere.

About the time Mrs. Gilchrist had arrived in America, Whitman became intimately acquainted with a trio of New Yorkers: John H. Johnston, a jeweler of artistic and literary interests; Edmund Clarence Stedman, a banker-poet and critic; and Richard Watson Gilder, a literary critic and editor of the Gilded Age. Johnston, who was later to give invaluable service in Whitman's behalf by getting benefits and lectures started in which the poet could discourse upon Lincoln, had, like many other admirers of the poet, read the *Leaves,* and had obtained from its lines a new vista and comprehension of life. Consequently he could not do too much for his benefactor, and invited him to his New York home which bordered on Central Park. Here, during visits made in 1877-79, Whitman met many celebrated New Yorkers whom Johnston went through much trouble to have Walt meet. Many times Whitman escaped to the park that lay close by, to get some freedom from the celebrities Johnston brought home. It was at Johnston's home that Whitman met Stedman, whom he had known casually in Washington during the Civil War, where Stedman served as a war correspondent.

Essentially friendly to Whitman, Stedman yet felt that Whitman's forthright and indecorous statements on sex and the sexual act in his poetry were not particularly fitting themes for poetry, a particularly fitting stand for a poet and critic of the Gilded Age to take. In a long essay which appeared in the November, 1880, issue of *Scribner's Magazine,* Stedman admitted that although the merits of Whitman's verse lay in its lyrical passion and frequent originality, the poet had failed to observe that nature respected certain decencies. "Where Mr. Whitman sees nothing but the law of procreation, poetry dwells upon the union of souls . . . "

Gilder, like Stedman, was bound to the literary canons which prevailed in poetic circles following the Civil War. In an effort to remove themselves from the realism which the war had brought in its wake, the poets of the period stressed form and the

ideal, criteria which Whitman's verse could not easily pass as the critics of the period interpreted these two literary canons. Gilder, who like Johnston, was to perform invaluable service in Whitman's behalf during the 80's in getting the ball rolling for lectures and benefits, in a letter years later[8] indicated the basis for his admiration for Whitman's verse, a basis totally at variance with the prevailing tastes and judgments of his day.

> I stand up for form in verse, but perhaps you will think me wrong, in insisting upon liking the chant of Whitman when he really hits it off, as in "When Lilacs Last in the Doorway Bloomed" and "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking." I wish for no other form for these. I have just been reading his "Tears," which follows soon after, and my eyes are wet. What a picture! What passion! What necessary form!

A New Yorker with whom Whitman really had more in common than the others mentioned was the naturalist, John Burroughs, who had been his ardent and devoted disciple during the Washington years.[9] Having left the capitol city in 1873 to take a position as a bank examiner in his native state, New York, Burroughs built himself a home upstate at Esopus, overlooking the Hudson River. Here until the end of his long life he kept himself busy at fruit farming and writing nature sketches.

While actually keeping in touch with Walt's progress in Camden and even visiting him there a few times, and having Walt in turn visit him at Esopus, Burroughs, of all the men who were intimately acquainted with the poet, allowed the relationship to cool over the next decade and a half, a fact which Whitman repeatedly noted. What makes this cooling off all the more remarkable is the fact that Burroughs, probably more than any other member of the circle which grew around Whitman in Camden, was most influenced by Whitman's outlook on life. One explanation for this alienation may be that as he grew older, Burroughs may have seen less need for relying on the mentor of his Washington years. Another reason may be that Burroughs may have just matured in his own way, as the nature works of his later years indicate.

Yet so strong was the attachment between both men during the

[8] *Letters of Richard Watson Gilder*, edited by Rosamund Gilder (New York, 1916), pp. 403-04.

[9] Burroughs came to Washington to be near the man whose poetry had influenced him.

late 1870's that Burroughs allowed the poet to edit an essay he had written on Whitman entitled "The Flight of the Eagle," even coming to Mrs. Gilchrist's home in Philadelphia where Walt was staying at the time. That Whitman should have edited an essay on himself should not be considered incredulous. From the early days of his literary career Whitman had written articles, seemingly written by others, praising his own motives and works. And editing this essay by Burroughs was not the first job of this kind which he had done. When Burroughs was working on his *Notes on Walt Whitman as Poet and Person* in 1867, the first book about Whitman written in America, the poet had edited the work.[10]

The "Eagle" essay may be taken as an indication of the way Burroughs viewed Whitman's work. To him never before had the human personality been sung in literature as it had been in the *Leaves*. However, the chief point in Whitman's writings was its sane sexuality, "the great lesson of Nature that must be preserved at all costs." If Whitman was wrong in his treatment of sex, he was wrong in every aspect of his message. This three years before Stedman's blast!

What is significant about Whitman's various visits to Esopus is the fact that the sights in and around the Hudson River area served to exhilarate him, and served as the basis of several poems, of which "The Dalliance of the Eagles" is best known. Various nature sketches Whitman wrote because of these visits were later published in *Specimen Days*. In the main the influence each man exerted on the other was naturally beneficial. Burroughs was inspired by Whitman, whom he considered a modern Homer. In turn Whitman obtained ideas for poems from the younger man, and also learned to be more detailed in his description of nature. Burroughs, on the other hand, learned in a measure to look at natural phenomena with the same largeness of view that characterized Whitman.

Of the many people who were to visit Whitman during these years, none had a greater insight into the poet's nature as a "lover

[10]Burroughs, like another ardent admirer Richard Maurice Bucke, whose biography of the poet appeared in 1883, felt that Whitman should have an opportunity to see the work about which he would be the central figure.

of comrades,"[11] not even Burroughs, than did Edward Carpenter, the English poet and critic, who came to America in 1877 to see the man with whom he had such a spiritual affinity. Having read William Michael Rossetti's edition of the *Leaves,* Carpenter had been so deeply impressed by the work that he had written Whitman as follows: "I feel that my work is to carry on what you have begun. You have opened the way: my only desire is to go onward with it." At first there would seem to be nothing in common between the austere, ascetic, and idealistic young Englishman and the turbulent, fleshly, sensual, eating, drinking, and breeding Whitman (as one of Carpenter's friends put it), who was disgusted with Carpenter's attachment to the American poet. Yet the same love of humanity that prompted Whitman to nurse soldiers during the Civil War also caused Carpenter to give up a lectureship at Cambridge University in order to visit the outlying districts of England and bring the advantages of education and learning to the lower classes.

But above and beyond this sense of humanity which characterized Carpenter's activity was the feeling the young Englishman shared with Whitman in regard to love of comrades. In Whitman's love of people, especially of men, Carpenter saw "one of the factors of future evolution." From Whitman's intimate ties with one or more male friends emerged "a new organic inspiration and a new power of life. His poems radiate this power in all directions." In short Carpenter thought that the longings Whitman hinted at should be boldly and serenely admitted, "as if we indeed were that person concerned, and convinced that in solving the problem we should be solving it for thousands and millions of others, and so helping to lighten a great load which today presses upon humanity."[12]

Once in America, Carpenter had ample opportunity to study Whitman at Stevens Street, Stafford Farm, and at Mrs. Gilchrist's. It was while Carpenter was visiting Whitman when the latter was staying at her home, that the Englishwoman made her countryman understand the physical and spiritual attraction that

[11]In her able book *Whitman and Burroughs: Comrades,* Dr. Clare Barrus makes the point that Burroughs was attracted to Whitman by the love he felt Whitman expressed for all mankind, that in short Whitman was a comrade to all.

[12]Edward Carpenter, *Some Friends of Walt Whitman* (London, 1924), p. 16.

the poet had held for her. When opening the *Leaves* and seeing the full-length engraving of Whitman, she felt that "here at last is the face of Christ which the painters have so long sought for and that reading of the book itself did but confirm and strengthen that first impression."

At Stafford Farm, Whitman let Carpenter know the ideas he had in mind when he first wrote the *Leaves*. "My original idea was if I could bring all men together by putting before them the heart of Man, with all its joys, sorrows and experiences and surroundings it would be a great thing." From the beginning he tried to strip off all ornaments and speak from and to the heart. Later it was a whim that prompted him to discard all conventional poetic phrases and every allusion to ancient and medieval imagery, scripts and styles, and stick to words and phrases appropriate to mid-nineteenth-century America. In his various talks with the poet, in accompanying him on a ferry ride to Philadelphia and noticing the friendly greetings bestowed on the poet by various passers-by, Carpenter realized that never was there a man who was more sure of what he was doing than Whitman was.

Interesting are Carpenter's reactions to and descriptions of Whitman as soon as they met. Approximately ten minutes after he had introduced himself, Carpenter became "aware of the immense vista or background in his [Whitman's] personality." While noting the poet's large benign influence and inclusiveness, the visitor detected something of reserve and sadness in him, together with "a sense of remoteness and inaccessibility." What was particularly impressive was Whitman's face, with the high arch of the eyebrows, giving a touch of childlike wonder and contemplation to his expression. While the eyes were full of a kind "of wistful tenderness, not contemplative, but perceptive," they were active rather than passive, "lying far back, steady, clear with definite pupils and heavy lids of passion and experience." It was a "face of majestic simple proportion" with the nose Greek in outline, straight and broad between the brows and meeting the line of the forehead without any great change of direction. The forehead was high, the head domed, the ears were large and the mouth full. The head was particularly characterized by its height

and "by a certain untamed wild hawk look, a look not uncommon among the Americans."

Visits Carpenter paid to Burroughs at Esopus and to the Boston literati convinced him, as far as Burroughs was concerned, that here was a man close to nature and to the human heart, and worth a dozen Holmeses and Lowells. When Emerson admitted that the first edition of the *Leaves* had shown some promise, but that Whitman was "a wayward, fanciful man," and that there was an absence of metre in the *Leaves,* Carpenter wrote Burroughs that Emerson was nothing but a "literary man" and that anybody so constituted could never accept Whitman.

When Carpenter returned to England he thought Niagara Falls to be the only thing in America to match Whitman in spirit, and that everything the poet had written had come from his own personal experience. The poet's bodily presence plus his conduct confirmed everything Carpenter had found in his poetry, and demonstrated that beyond Whitman's simple and unconcerned exterior lay great depth.

The year 1877 was in fact an important year insofar as the circle around Whitman was forming. While Carpenter cannot of necessity be termed a member of this group, still he did aid Whitman financially from time to time, by sending him gifts of money. However, in the fall of this year Whitman was visited by Dr. Richard Maurice Bucke, a Canadian alienist, who was destined to become one of the three most important members of the circle. A mature man of forty-two at the time of his visit, Bucke was by nature a deeply religious man. A spiritual illumination he had experienced a few years prior to his visit to Camden had only deepened his bent towards mysticism.

Bucke's early years read like a Horatio Alger tale in the sense that all sorts of trials and tribulations had been overcome (including the amputation of one complete foot and half of the other) until he had graduated from McGill University with high honors as an alienist. Some time later he became chief medical superintendent of a large insane asylum in London, Ontario, where he instituted a series of administrative reforms in dealing with the insane, for which he was highly praised.

Having read Rossetti's edition of the *Leaves* in 1868, Bucke

later admitted that for a period of nine years he was repelled and bewildered by it, until, as in Johnston's case, the light broke through and its message was made clear to him. Hence the visit to Whitman in 1877. Bucke's words regarding the interview must be read to be believed. Although the interview was brief, Bucke was "almost amazed by the beauty and majesty of his person and the gracious air of purity that surrounded and permeated" the poet. Again, " . . . a sort of spiritual intoxication set in . . . It seemed to me at that time certain that he was either actually a god or in some sense clearly and entirely preterhuman. Be all this as it may, it is certain that the hour spent that day with the poet was the turning point of my life."[13]

Bucke tried to get his "god" to visit him in Canada as soon as possible, but it was not until the summer of 1880 that the poet visited his Canadian follower for a period of three months. At his home the alienist had more time to study Whitman daily and to appreciate his presence, and what impressed him most was the deep sense of purity which pervaded the poet. Although Whitman's clothes appeared worn at times, they were always spotless, and this physical cleanliness seemed to be a direct emanation of his mental purity as far as Bucke was concerned.

When not busy with his new fervid friend, Whitman spent time with his host's family, especially with the younger children. Visits to the asylum which Bucke made possible were soon discontinued since Whitman became depressed at the sight and activities of the inmates. A trip up through the St. Lawrence river region made Whitman only more appreciative of the average sunset and sunrise as against the many spectacular sights the region afforded.

It was as a result of this trip to Canada that Bucke got the idea of writing Whitman's biography, with the express purpose of explaining Whitman's greatness. As to explaining Whitman's genius, Bucke failed (he was to succeed later, as we shall see), but not before he finished writing a paean in behalf of Whitman.[14] With Whitman's help (both visited West Hills, Long Island, the poet's birthplace, early in 1881, to obtain more light on the poet's

[13] *Walt Whitman Fellowship Papers*, VI (Philadelphia, September, 1894).
[14] Richard Maurice Bucke, *Walt Whitman* (Philadelphia, 1883).

early background and antecedents), Bucke wrote ardently of the poet and his work. To Bucke the *Leaves* was a forerunner of the millennial estate, and like the other bibles of the world such as the *Vedas,* the *Koran,* etc., limned the outline of a new spiritual era, and what these foregoing books were to their age, the *Leaves* would in time be to the future of American civilization.

Whitman, who had written the first twenty-four pages, dealing with his background, and who oversaw its writing in general, felt that the book was so heavily weighted in his favor that he felt constrained to have Bucke insert a long list of adverse contemporary reviews of himself and the *Leaves* in the appendix.

It was not until 1891, however, that Bucke became definitely convinced that he could explain the basis of Whitman's genius. In London, England, during this year Bucke underwent a spiritual experience which made clear the mystical experience he had had some twenty years previously, and which he felt gave him an insight into Whitman's nature which he had previously been unable to explain. To describe the large and universal nature of Whitman's personality Bucke coined a term "Cosmic Consciousness." In his book on the subject[15] the alienist claimed that three definite states of consciousness could be included in the evolutionary process from which the world had evolved. The first was simple consciousness, that which was expressed by the upper half of the animal kingdom. To this first step, which consisted in becoming aware of exterior objects, was in time added a second step, namely, self-consciousness, in which man became conscious of himself as a separate entity. "Cosmic Consciousness," the third step, was higher than self-consciousness, and had come only to a few rare individuals in the history of the race, notably to its religious and spiritual leaders. Those individuals who possessed this consciousness, according to Bucke, understood the underlying purpose of the universe, and saw it not as dead matter but as spiritual and alive. In this universe, life was immortal and death was an absurdity. However foolish the conclusions of cosmic consciousness may have appeared from the viewpoint of self-

[15]Richard Maurice Bucke, *Cosmic Consciousness: a Study in the Evolution of the Human Mind* (Philadelphia, 1901).

consciousness, they were true, Bucke claimed, pointing to the great religions to bear him out.

Declaring that only the great spiritual leaders of the past, such as Jesus, Paul, Pletinus, Mohammed, together with certain literary men like Dante, Blake, and Balzac, were blessed with this sense, Bucke also placed Whitman in this category. However, where the others were overpowered by the cosmic sense, Whitman was the only one who was not mastered by it but instead used it for his own purposes, allowing it to live side by side with his other self. With this theory of cosmic consciousness Bucke was ready to explain the contrast in Whitman's work before and after 1855. Pointing out that Whitman's early work was mediocre and conventional, Bucke claimed that after 1855 there came pages "across each of which in letters of ethereal fire are written the words of 'ETERNAL LIFE': pages covered not only by a masterpiece, but by such vital sentences as have not been written ten times in the history of the race."

At a dinner at which Bucke spoke, one guest, William Osler, the famous Canadian physician, was so impressed by the alienist's apotheosis of the Camden bard, that he made it his business to visit Whitman when he got the opportunity. Later, Osler served as Whitman's physician during the latter's last illness.

Such then was the genius of the man who could be so inspired by the poet's message as to write a biography, as well as evolve a new philosophy of the universe called Cosmic Consciousness to explain Whitman's creative power. All through the Camden years Bucke was to visit his "god" at regular intervals, and during Walt's last ailing years he was to be unceasing in his ministrations both financially and spiritually, in helping his friend. It is no wonder that Richard Maurice Bucke was, after Whitman's death, found to be one of the three literary executors Whitman had appointed. Such devotion as he had shown during Whitman's lifetime deserved this reward.

In addition to having people of the calibre of Carpenter and Bucke visiting him, Whitman was beginning to meet the natives of Camden, especially those with whom he had something in common. To appreciate better the kind of city Camden was in

the 1870's and 1880's, one should remember that its chief claim to fame was that it was the transfer point to Atlantic City. The fact that it was also the depot of the Camden and Amboy Railroad only added to the dinginess of the town. Building prospectors, expecting the town to boom in the 70's, had built row upon row of cheap houses. The town did not boom, and Camden became to Philadelphia what Weekawken became to New York. Of a population of twenty thousand during the 70's, most of the workers of the town were dockmen, express drivers, and mechanics who worked in Philadelphia, and who made their way back to Camden at night on the five ferries provided for that purpose. The two chief industries in the town were the Esterbrook Pen Works and the Camden Iron Works.

That such a town was not intellectually exciting goes without saying, but Whitman managed to find men with whom he established a rapport, and they in turn treated him as "one of the boys." Representing the respectable folks of the town, this group of people of whom Whitman and three others constituted the nucleus, was referred to as the Old Guard. Whitman's association with the Old Guard is important for the light it casts on the townspeople who associated with him and how they felt about him.

One would think by the yearly talks and meetings given in Camden each May 31st to commemorate Whitman's birthday, that the poet was always admired and revered by his fellow Camdenites. Such was not the case. As late as 1919, Whitman was the object of unmitigated hostility. In that year a young Italian admirer of the *Leaves,* one Guido Bruno, visited Camden expressly to see the Mickle Street home, and was referred to William Kettler, the town librarian, as one who "used to be a great friend of his." Kettler promptly excoriated Whitman, calling him "an old loafer," and a "smutty old man," who had to be stopped by Henry Bonsall from telling off-color stories in his newspaper office. Dane Yorke, living in Camden around this period, felt impelled to find out why Whitman was so cordially detested by Camden's respectable citizens. His article[16] revealed that around 1878 Whit-

[16]Dane Yorke, "Whitman in Camden," *American Mercury,* IX, 355-65 (July, 1926).

man was an accepted member of an Old Guard group, but that within a few years Whitman had lost caste because of a series of circumstances.

However in the late 70's in a group which included as its nucleus Colonel Johnston, Dr. James M. Ridge, Dr. Raynall Coates, and Whitman, the poet found himself mentally at ease with his fellow members. Of this nucleus all were large, well-proportioned figures, and each sported a long flowing white beard. As a result, Whitman was often mistaken for another of the group, and vice versa. Of the trio with whom Whitman had most in common, Coates was the one most interested in literature, and the one who most argued with Whitman, whom he thought incapable of writing an English sentence. Of Whitman's poems, Coates liked best "The Mystic Trumpeter," but only for its conception, not for its form. At any rate the Old Guard group enjoyed talking on such subjects as philosophy, religion, literature, politics, science, and art, and Whitman, who participated in these discussions, was more respected for being "one of the boys" than for his poetry.

By 1881, however, when Whitman ran afoul of the law because of a projected publishing of his *Leaves* in its entirety, the Old Guard seems to have cooled towards him. They would have allowed Whitman to go his own way and not have regarded him as their *bete noire* but for two further incidents. One concerned itself with Whitman's later hiring of a comely widow to act as his housekeeper in his Mickle Street home, an act not in accord with the social mores of a small town in the 80's. The other heinous (in the eyes of the Old Guard) incident dealt with the deification of the poet as a sort of nineteenth-century Messiah by his followers during these same years. Little did they realize how Whitman bade his followers to stop laying it on, so to speak. The birthday dinner of 1889, given in honor of Whitman, the Old Guard found particularly difficult to take, feeling it was just a worked-up affair and a bit of literary log-rolling.

In view of these circumstances, it is not hard to see how the respectable Camdenites would in time feel that Whitman was nothing but a "loafer" and a reprobate. But by 1926 when a hotel, a garage, and a building-and-loan association were named after

him, the tide had begun to change. Whitman was once more *persona grata* to Camden's respectability.

Yet if Whitman was misinterpreted and maligned by the Old Guard after 1881, there were others in town who remained fairly friendly and loyal to the poet, once they got to know him. Four of these people were lawyers, namely James Matlock Scovel, Charles G. Garrison, John W. Wescott, and Samuel H. Grey. Garrison and Grey were to make speeches at the 1889 birthday dinner, of which more at the appropriate time. Wescott appears to have been fond of Whitman and his poetry but, because of a busy law practice, found little time to visit the poet. Of the four, Scovel probably knew him best,[17] but since he had a talent for dramatic but highly untruthful statements, it is sufficient to say that Scovel aided and befriended Whitman in divers ways, often having him over at his home on Sundays for dinners. Once he even went to New York on Walt's account and scared the daylights out of one Richard Worthington, who was selling unauthorized copies of the *Leaves.*

A school teacher Whitman knew at this time who later became principal of the First School District was Geoffrey Buckwalter. In fact it may have been Buckwalter who suggested the poem to celebrate the opening of the Cooper Street School. At any event Buckwalter met Whitman many times on Sunday afternoons when the poet was invited to dinner at the home of one of his devoted friends.

As for any mention of Whitman in the intellectual periodicals of the area, there is but one entry. Prowell's *History of Camden County,* published in 1886, grouped Whitman with its "Authors and Scientists," but put him well down on the list. A review of the poet's life, probably written by himself, was very cursory and gave no impression of what Whitman stood for.

Such then was Whitman's status as a poet and as a person during the late 70's and 80's as far as Camden was concerned. While Walt made friends with members of the Old Guard and the lawyers mentioned above, the first group had little to do with him

[17]James Matlock Scovel, "Walt Whitman as I Knew Him," *National Magazine,* XX, 165-69 (May, 1904).

after 1881. The lawyers, on the other hand, seem to have remained friendly toward him until his death.

Besides making friends or alienating them, as the case may be, Walt had his usual number of visitors calling upon him. None was more important to the circle forming around him than William Sloane Kennedy who called upon him in the winter of 1880. Where other friends and followers made their help available to Whitman either financially or socially, Kennedy, a literary critic and a biographer, used his pen in Walt's behalf, writing at least four articles and a book while Whitman was alive. These stimulated interest in certain phases of Whitman's life and writings.

On the staff of the *American,* a literary weekly published in Philadelphia, when he first saw Walt, Kennedy was deeply impressed with the manner in which the poet evoked the Greek outdoor spirit in a few simple sentences: "I can't tell how it was but the large personality of the man so vivified the few words he spoke that all the majesty of Greece—especially her sculpturesque art-idea seemed to loom up before me as never before in my life, although the study of Greek literature had been a specialty of my collegiate and post-collegiate years."

When it came to an appreciation of Walt's poetry, in an article[18] written soon after both met, Kennedy was ready to acknowledge the Camden bard as the first great poet of Democracy, but was repelled by the "coarse indecencies of language" in the "Children of Adam" poems. Finding much that was good in Whitman, Kennedy was not yet ready to accept the poet's levelling of humanity into one democratic mass, pointing to the law of universal differentiation, and noting that anarchy, and not democracy, would result if national leaders and superior personages were not acknowledged as such. Furthermore, most of what Whitman called poetry Kennedy considered pure prose. The compositions that were poetry, however, were magnificent "nuggets of gold in vast masses of quartz," and so valuable did he consider Whitman's thought that he was willing to obtain it in any form, rather than not get it at all.

[18]William Sloane Kennedy, "A Study of Walt Whitman," *The Californian,* III, 149-58 (February, 1881).

So while not a whole-hearted acceptor of Walt's poetry (a condition Whitman during these years increasingly equated with loyalty), Kennedy, like Bucke before him, succumbed to the poet's personal magnetism. Writing to Burroughs in reference to the article he had recently finished on Walt, Kennedy compared Whitman to Jesus, after first noting that "he [Whitman] is one of the prophets and saviours of the world."

> But he is more perfect than Jesus. What Jesus gained in the spirituelle violet quality of his nature he lost in breadth and rich universality of nature. What Whitman gains in breadth and rich universality of nature he loses in the delicate quality, though he has a deep fusion of that in his nature, too.

Along in 1881 Kennedy left Philadelphia for Boston, where he obtained a position as proofreader for Houghton, Mifflin and Company, and in the same year started his book on Walt, which was meant to be the record of the poet's life after 1881, the point at which Bucke's biography ended.[19] However, the book turned out to be more a compilation of interesting impressions and explanations of Walt's poetry than a biography. Also included were extracts of the correspondence which had started between both men and which extended from February, 1881, through September, 1891. For the most part, Whitman's letters and post cards to Kennedy were written after 1886, and were largely a record of his continuously failing health during that period.

Once in visiting the poet at Stafford Farm, Kennedy, like Carpenter before him, was let in on the purpose behind the *Leaves,* namely, "to put on record a complete individual; make a clean breast of it, give a true picture of the nineteenth-century man."

In an article written in 1885,[20] Kennedy pleaded for a greater technical freedom in poetry, claiming that unfettered expression was the need of the times. Stating that Swinburne was one of the few poets in the world who could compose symphonic word music, he cited Whitman as one of the others who, in his rhythmic chants, revealed that his poetic art was entirely in harmony with the laws of nature and symphonic music. As for the burial

[19]William Sloane Kennedy, *Reminiscences of Walt Whitman* (Paisley and London, 1896).

[20]William Sloane Kennedy, *The Poet as Craftsman* (Philadelphia, 1886), pp. 3-20.

hymn in honor of Lincoln, "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd," Kennedy believed that "scarcely since Homer has such a thunder-roll of rhythmic harmony been heard in literature as undulated through this splendid threnody, while of its delicate adaptation of line and rhythm to changing motive there is no hint in Homer."

Two other articles Kennedy wrote about Whitman deserve treatment at this point because of the light they throw on the poet's antecedents. The first dealt with Walt's Quaker ancestry.[21] Tracing the poet's Quaker lineage to his mother, Kennedy listed those qualities in Whitman which he thought represented the Quaker faith, seeing in Whitman's enormous self-reliance the doctrine of the "Inner Light" with its stress on heeding the intuitions of one's soul. Self-respect, esteem for every human being, sincerity, plainness, placidity, silence, unconventionalism, belief in the right of free speech, benevolence, friendliness, and deep religiousness were the other qualities Kennedy saw as having derived from Walt's Quaker lineage. Personal survivals of Quakerism in the poet himself were reflected in his dress, and in his placid temperament, which to Kennedy accounted for Whitman's satisfaction with the quiet life of Philadelphia.

Having delved into one aspect of Whitman's ancestry led Kennedy to make a further study the following year.[22] Whitman's ancestry was seen as having derived from a three-fold basis. These included the English strain, going back to the Puritanism of Cromwell's time, as well as the Quaker and the Dutch strains. The last element Kennedy considered the most important in Whitman's makeup, exceeding in importance even the Quaker aspect. Subtitled "Is not his maternal line the chief one," the article placed its main emphasis on Whitman's maternal ancestry. Accordingly, Whitman's physique and emotional temperament were seen to have derived from his mother, who along with her father, Major Van Velsor, typified the Hollandesque physiognomy, color, and physique. To his Dutch lineage, Kennedy attributed Walt's stubborness, firmness, and phlegmatic nature, as

[21] William S. Kennedy, "The Quaker Traits of Walt Whitman," *The Conservator*, I, 36 (July, 1890).

[22] William S. Kennedy, "Dutch Traits of Walt Whitman," *The Conservator*, I, 90-91 (Feb., 1891).

well as his endurance, practicality, sanity, thrift, excessive neatness, and purity of person. Noting the characteristics of the Dutch, which Taine, the literary historian, had pointed out in his study, such as their love of silence, absorption of mind, long planning, preference of depth to shining surfaces, and their soft and sluggish nature which produced a vast content and a great disposition toward sensuousness, Kennedy claimed these qualities for Whitman also. However, what separated Whitman from the Old World Netherlanders was the deep spirituality and the soaring and mystical philosophy he practiced. But to think of Whitman as essentially sprung from far-off Holland, the cradle of Old World liberty, was a mistake, Kennedy warned. The truth was that Whitman was neither an Englishman, a Dutchman, nor a Quaker. He was nothing but an American pagan, with English, Dutch, and Quaker traits plainly noted in his background.

All told, the years 1876-80 were rich in affiliations with New Yorkers such as Burroughs, Johnston, Stedman, and Gilder making their presence felt in behalf of Whitman. Later they were aided and abetted by two stout defenders of Whitman, Bucke and Kennedy. In short, a solid contribution had been made to the circle of people befriending and aiding Whitman. The next three years were to be tranquil as far as members of the circle were concerned, but hectic on some other account. James R. Osgood, a Boston publisher, who had published the works of many of the New England writers, was given the idea that it would be a fine thing to publish a definitive edition of Whitman's poetry. When approached on the subject, Whitman, who was in the city during April, 1881, to give his talk on Lincoln, agreed, but on one condition: "Fair warning on one point, the sexuality odes about which the original row was started and kept up so long are all retained and must go in the same as ever." Returning to Boston in the middle of August to see his work through the press, Walt stayed on for almost three months, returning to Camden in November, fully satisfied with the edition of the *Leaves* that Osgood had just begun to publish. In February, 1882, after selling for three months, the book was declared immoral by the Boston Society for the Suppression of Vice, which took steps to have it banned. At first when Walt was notified by Osgood that certain

of his lines were found objectionable, he thought the mere deletion of a few objectionable passages would satisfy the Boston censors and regarded the fact that he was willing to delete anything as a great concession. Later, when it became known that the censors wished three whole poems deleted, namely, "The Dalliance of the Eagles," "A Woman Waits for Me," and "To a Common Prostitute," Whitman balked.[23] Osgood, fearful of the notoriety that would ensue from taking the case to court, decided to supress the edition and returned the plates to Whitman in April.

When it became evident that Osgood meant to stop publishing the *Leaves,* the reaction of the members of the circle was similar to that expressed by Burroughs and O'Connor in defending Whitman against the genteel critics in 1876. Kennedy, Bucke, and of course Burroughs and O'Connor wrote to the newspapers lambasting Osgood and the officials concerned in the case. Keeping informed on how things were going, they maintained a continuous cycle of correspondence among themselves in regard to the affair.

During the winter and spring of 1882 the Osgood suppression was not the only matter with which Walt was concerned. In January, Oscar Wilde, the British wit and esthete, visited Camden, where Walt was deeply impressed by the young Englishman whom he called "the great big splendid boy." In America on a lecture tour, Wilde chatted amiably about Victorian literature, and told Whitman how deeply impressed he was by the American masses, who in intelligence, education, and well-being greatly surpassed the corresponding classes in the old country. Later, while traveling in the western part of our country, Wilde remarked that, outside of Whitman, the only object in the United States that humbled him was the Rocky Mountains.[24]

The same year as Wilde's visit, Whitman met a prominent Quaker, Robert Pearsall Smith, who came to ridicule the poet[25]

[23]The threat of suppression and prosecution had been changed to allow for publication after appropriate expurgation.

[24]Lloyd Lewis and H. J. Smith, *Oscar Wilde Discovers America* (New York, 1936), p. 97.

[25]He went only because his daughter, Mary, a Smith College student, home for Easter, made it clear that despite his objections she was going to visit Whitman, of whose merits as a poet she had been informed by a woman lecturer at school.

but, like others, succumbed to his charm. Smith, the father of the writer-to-be, Logan Pearsall Smith,[26] was so deeply impressed by Whitman during his first visit, that he invited Walt to his spacious home in Philadelphia. Walt accepted, accompanied his guests back to their home and remained with them for a month.

Although he was part Quaker himself, Whitman's philosophy of life, had stressed the body as well as the soul. This was in direct conflict with the traditional Quaker's concept of life which, according to the "Inner Light," laid emphasis solely on the spirit. Therefore, Whitman did not get along too well with Hannah Smith, Robert's wife, who was a strict adherent of the orthodox view. Hence while Whitman was at Smith's home, Quaker friends and relatives of the family stayed away. However, Smith's friendship made Whitman the recipient of numerous privileges, which included the right to visit Smith's home whenever he wished, a favor Whitman made much use of, sometimes taking along friends like Bucke and Burroughs when they were in Camden.

Logan, in company with his sister, visited Whitman from time to time, and was deeply interested in Whitman's method of writing poetry. This Logan saw as consisting of a complete surrender to the experience he was undergoing at the time, together with a patient effort to grasp its deepest meaning. This experience Whitman then tried to embody in the most significant words possible. Logan's love for the *Leaves,* to which he felt he owed so much,[27] was reflected when he later attended Oxford University. There he sold sixty dollars' worth of books in Whitman's behalf.

Because of the notoriety engendered by the Osgood suppression, Whitman sought to publish the *Leaves* on his own. Borrowing a hundred dollars from Burroughs, he commenced publishing his book in June, "but found it vexatious from the start." After publishing approximately fifty copies of this "Author's Edition," Whitman found the man who was to take care of his publishing needs until his death, namely, David McKay.[28] Manager of a

[26]Logan Pearsall Smith, *Unforgotten Years* (Boston, 1939), pp. 92-108.

[27]It [the *Leaves*] "gave us ears, it gave us eyes, it revealed to us the miracle of our existence."

[28]Only the *Complete Poems and Prose* (1888) was not published by McKay; Walt published this book personally because he wished "to let it sort of go from my hands into the hands of the reader."

book store owned by Rees Welsh, a publisher of law books, McKay was instrumental in having his boss publish the edition suppressed by Osgood.[29] Welsh's first edition of the *Leaves* of a thousand copies came out in the middle of July and sold out in one day. A second edition, printed soon after, sold out in five days. When Welsh decided to stick to the publishing of law books, McKay became Whitman's sole publisher.

With his publishing needs now cared for, Walt was now ready to receive his accustomed flow of visitors, one of whom was Elbert Hubbard, the American imitator of William Morris' ideas on handicrafts, and later famous for his essay "Message to Garcia." During 1883 he was on one of his little journeys to the homes of the great,[30] visiting Walt in the cool of an August evening. In the few minutes both men spent with each other outside Colonel George's house, Hubbard became deeply impressed with Whitman's thought, and felt that the poet had a peculiarly universal quality. But this was paradoxical, too, Hubbard thought. For while Whitman loved all men as brothers, they did not understand him; again, while he loved children, he had none of his own. In summing up, Hubbard found that Whitman had a message for mankind, which placed him between Milton and Dante. "Where Milton knew Heaven, and Dante knew Hell, Whitman showed us earth."

Soon after his return from Ocean Grove, a seashore resort in New Jersey, a trip he took at the end of September, Walt became acquainted with Francis H. Williams, with whose family he spent the Christmas holiday of 1883. Williams was a friend of Robert Pearsall Smith, through whom he presumably met Whitman. Williams, at first a bank clerk, who later turned to literature himself, becoming the author of numerous volumes of poetry, together with Harrison S. Morris, also a poet, and Talcott Williams, a newspaper man on the editorial staff of the Philadelphia *Press,* formed a triumvirate who, while espousing Whitman's poetry, did so with reservations. This in Whitman's view,

[29]Welsh's store was a block away from the Mercantile Library, which Walt frequented, and was one of the two second hand book stores which he visited from time to time. Right after the Osgood suppression Walt walked in one day; McKay saw him, knew what had happened, and spoke to Welsh.

[30]In all, Hubbard visited 170 homes resulting in the like number of essays.

meant no support at all, so insistent had he become in his desire to be completely accepted or rejected.

At any rate Whitman spent the Christmas season with his new friend in their home in the Germantown section of Philadelphia, amusing himself by playing with his host's children, one of whom the boy "Churchey" later remembered Whitman as "shaggy and rugged like an old bear." In recounting his experience in meeting the Williams family, Whitman told his biographer:

> I think I have told you how splendidly the Williamses have always received me in their home? Their home was a sort of asylum (like the old churches, temples) when so many homes were closed against me. They were like the Gilders—they were not afraid even in the days of greatest outcry to ask me round, to have me cackle and rub feathers with them in their own coop.[31]

Whitman's meeting with the Williams family may, in a way, be regarded as rounding out the first half of Walt's eighteen-year stay in Camden. When he first arrived in the city, where he was to remain until his death, Whitman was broken in spirit and body. Yet slowly and persistently, his spirit mended, and even physically he was to regain the use of his limbs enough so that he could navigate, as he put it, with the aid of a cane; and in general his literary fortunes improved. Most important of all, Walt made friends in and around Camden, and in areas beyond, who became loyal supporters and adherents of his poetic credo and philosophy of life. The time had come for these friends to become more purposeful in their ministrations to their "god" and for certain new members of the circle to give these ministrations direction in extending and perpetuating Whitman's literary reputation. For this purpose Whitman needed a place of his own, where he could come and go as he pleased, and be his own boss. In short the time had come for him to leave his brother's home and move into Mickle Street.

[31]Horace L. Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, II, 341. (The three volumes Traubel published of his talks with Whitman came out as follows: Vol. I, Boston, 1906; Vol. II, New York, 1908; Vol. III, New York, 1914.)

Travel Contrasts: Chancellor Kent's Impressions of New Jersey 1793 and 1821

FRED SHELLEY

CHANCELLOR James Kent (1763-1847), of New York, hurried through New Jersey in one day in 1821 and described the trip in a single paragraph. Twenty-eight years earlier he had viewed the Garden State at a more leisurely pace, and he left a fuller account. Kent wrote down both what he saw and what he heard. Lawyer-like, he is precise in his descriptions. The travel accounts which follow are copied from the original manuscripts in the Kent Papers in the Library of Congress.[1] Capital letters have been provided at the beginnings of sentences, but otherwise punctuation, abbreviations, etc., remain as in the original. Such identifications as seem necessary, and as are possible, have been provided.

Kent is known to generations of lawyers for his *Commentaries on American Law* (four volumes, 1826-30). A graduate of Yale College in 1781, he practiced law in New York after the Revolution. He was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress in 1792 and later served three terms in the New York state assembly. Columbia College appointed him its first professor of law. His service on the bench culminated in his appointment as chancellor of the New York Court of Chancery. After his compulsory retirement in 1823 at the age of sixty, Kent wrote the volumes that are the chief basis of his fame.[2]

THE EDITOR of these travel accounts is the newly-appointed librarian of the New Jersey Historical Society. He was formerly librarian and editor of the Maryland Historical Society, and previously had served for several years on the staff of the Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress.

[1]Two other portions of the travel accounts have appeared in print: Frederick R. Goff, "The Federal City in 1793," *Library of Congress Quarterly Journal*, IX (November, 1951), 3-8, and "A New Yorker in Maryland: 1793 and 1821," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XLVII (June, 1952), 135-145.

[2]For brief biographical account, see *Dictionary of American Biography*, X, 344-47.

Not long after his unsuccessful candidacy to Congress, Kent was employed by James Greenleaf, a speculator in Washington, D.C., real estate, to make a trip to the new capitol city. So much of his journal as concerns New Jersey follows:

Between the 5th December 1793 & the 3d. January 1794 both Inclusive I performed a Journey from New York to the City of Washington & Alexandria on the Potomack. The Distance to Alexandria as the Post Road runs being 251 Miles. I went in the public Stage with James Greenleaf[3] Esq. & Mr. Charles Laguenne a French Gentleman, & the following facts & Observations are the result of the Tour.

After leaving Powles' [Paulus] Hook, & passing thro the Dutch Village of *Bergen* the first Object that attracts the attention of the Traveller is the Hackinsack River & Ferry at the Distance of 4 Miles from N York. This River is 460 Yards wide at the Ferry on a bank ¼th of a Mile, & the Tide ascends above it. It empties into Newark Bay just below the Ferry & is navigable for 15 Miles. *Posaik* [Passaic] River is one mile W. of the Hackinsack, & is sometimes called *second River.* A salt Marsh divides the Rivers, & on each Side of these Rivers are salt Meadows with muddy Soil of a very low Texture. They are very extensive on the west Side of *Newark-Bay* at the Head of which enters these two Rivers. When I crossed the Mouth of this Bay which is 2 Miles wide from Elizabeth Town Point to Staten-Island Creek, a View up the Bay & the low meadows surrounding it gave it the aspect almost of the Sea; the land at the head being so low & perhaps 8 Miles Distance that it was but just visible, with the exception only of *Snake Hill*[4] which resembles an Island rising from the Meadows. The Posaik is about ½ as wide as the Hackinsack, & at high water it is 24 feet deep at the Ferry. It is navigable about 10 Miles. The Inconvenience of crossing these Rivers is so great expecially as it is the high Road between NY & Philadelphia that an incorporated Company formed by Subscription is now building Bridges over these Rivers, & are to be rewarded by Tolls.[5] The Bridge over the Hackinsack is 1 Mile above the Ferry. The water at the Bridge is 30 feet deep. It is supported by wooden Pillars. It is the Bridge over the Posaik which is 4 Miles above that Ferry. These Pillars have [been sunk] 15 Feet into the Mud at the Bottom of the River. These Bridges with the Causeways over the Meadows are contemplated to be finished the next Season.

From Posaik to *Newark* is 3 Miles making 8 Miles from New York. This is said to be one of the most flourishing & handsome Towns in Jersey.

[3]Kent handled legal work in connection with the purchase of lots in Washington. The speculation was a financial disaster for Greenleaf; see Goff, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[4]"Snake Hill," the geological oddity which is probably the eroded stump of an ancient volcano.

[5]For details, see C. H. Winfield, *History of the County of Hudson* (New York, 1874), pp. 360-63.

The two principal Streets are lined with very neat Houses. Its [First] Preb Church is built of the famous Newark Stone, & the Steeple is tall & elegant. Indeed it is the largest & best Building in the State. It has also an episcopal Church [Trinity Church] of an old & venerable aspect standing on the upper Green with a Green before it, & a Court House & Goal. The Soil here is excellent, & the Price of Land surrounding this Town is from £30 to £40 per Acre. It is covered with Orchards & Newark has been long famous for its *Cyder* which however is said by many to be too sweet. It also manufactures & exports large quantities of *Shoes*. I think I was informed they have erected an academy [Newark Academy] here, & that it cost 25,000 Dollars. The Town of *Patterson* at Posaik Falls is 16 Miles N.W. of this Place, & the Ride to it on the Banks of the River is most delightful, from the extensive View of the country & its Improvements, & the picturesque Landscape of the River, its windings & its Banks. The national Manufactory[6] at Patterson has lately began to afford brighter Prospects. The State of N Jersey holds 100 Shares, & its Legislature patronizes the undertaking.

There is a famous Stone Building erected for the purpose of containing the different Machines for carding, spinning &c. It is 4 Stories high, & about 80 feet long. The waters of the River is newly brought to this Building, & with very little more expence can be done when the Machinery is ready. The Superintendent Mr [Peter] Colt has lately made some advantageous Contracts with Manufacturers from Ireland. The Stockholders choose Directors annually to manage the affairs of the Corporation. Cotton will be the Article principally manufactured here for the present. From Newark to

Elizabeth-Town is 7 Miles making 15 Miles from New York. This is a very handsome Town, & has very much the appearance in the goodness & neatness of its Buildings & Soil, to Newark tho it is said to be not equal either in Beauty or Prosperity. The point at the Mouth of Newark Bay is 2 Miles E. of this Town, a Creek navigable for small craft comes up to the Town. There is here also a brick [First] Presby. Church which is next to Newark Church in Beauty & Height of its Steeple. The upper Part of the Steeple is lined with Tin which gives a brilliant appearance in the Sun Shine. This Mode of decorating the Churches, & public Buildings, with lofty Steeples gives an air of wealth, Taste & Grandeur to the Town which strikes forcibly on the Eye & Observation of the Traveller. It seems to be a part of the national Taste of N. England, for we see but little of this fashion to the Southward. In Baltimore & Alexandria they actually have little wretched scaffolds adjoining their largest & plain Brick Churches for the purpose of Bells, as if Steeples were a Deformity. However in Baltimore they are now correcting their Taste, for the [First] Presby. Church building there has a Steeple on each Side of the Building when completed

[6]Created by the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures.

will be singularly grand. The Land about Elizabeth-Town is good, & in good Cultivation. In the compact Part of the Town there are perhaps 160 Houses. This is one of the oldest Towns in Jersey. It was purchased of the Indians in 1664, & settled soon after. The Seat ["Liberty Hall"] of the late Gov. [William] Livingston about 1 Mile Westward of the Town has been much admired for its tasty [?] Improvements but it is not to be seen from the Post Road. From Elizabeth-Town to

Woodbridge is 10 Miles Thro a champayne [champaign?], & well cultivated Country. There is no appearance of a Town at Woodbridge. An indifferent little wooden Church is to be seen E. of the Road. The Village of *Raway* lies between Eliz. & this Place, & looks like a rich & neat Village blessed with a good Soil. Raway is noted for Brick manufactureres. It exports large quantities to N York & elsewhere. But the new Patent Machine invented by Apollos Kingsley must soon destroy all other exertions in this line. One of these Machines will cost 80 Dol. will last an age & 3 Men & 1 Horse to 1 Machine will not only tread out & prepare the Clay, but make from 15, to 20,000 Brick in a Day; wh[ile] 1 Man without it, only can make 700. This amazing abridgement of Labor is attended also with this advantage that the Brick being pressed in one Mole by the Machine are more uniform, smooth, & solid, but require more Wood to burn them. From Woodbridge to

New Brunswick an incorporated Town on the S. Side of the Rariton is 10 Miles making 35 Miles from N York. The Roads are fine, but the Soil after we leave Raway looks more thin, & continues so quite to Philadelphia in the general View. And from Newark quite down to the Potomac the Soil has a red appearance, very unusual in the upper Parts of N York & Connecticut. Between Woodbridge & Brunswick we have a fine View of the Bay into which the Rariton empties & of both the Amboy, & sometimes as far as the light House on Sandy Hook is visible by the naked eye. A Bridge is erected & partly completed by another incorporated Company over the Rariton at Brunswick.[7] It meets precisely the principal Street & is 250 Yards long, being the width of the River here. It is supported by Stone Pillars with long wooden Arches between them for the Water & Ice to pass under; but so badly were the Pillars made that during my Journey South, the Ice had broken in upon 3 of the Pillars, & weakened the whole. The planks of the Bridge were not laid, tho Messrs King & Greenleaf walked over with much temerity & Danger. Sloops can come up to the Bridge, tho above it is fordable at low Water. This Town is 12 Miles above Amboy which stands on a Neck of Land at its Mouth on the N Side & at the Mouth of the Sound or Kull [Kill] running between Staten-Island & Jersey. This Town of Perth Amboy is most delightful for its Prospect & happy for its Harbor—great attempts have been made by

[7]For details, see W. H. Benedict, *New Brunswick in History* (New Brunswick, 1925), pp. 55-58.

Jersey [to promote] it, but it cannot thrive under the Shade of N York. South-Amboy is opposite the other, & on the S. Side of the Rariton Bay. Brunswick has upwards of 200 Houses & about 1,800 Souls one-half of which are Dutch. The principal Street is under the Hill almost as low as the River, & they are apprehansive the new Bridge may dam up the Ice in Spring so as to injure the Town by the floods of the River. This Street is paved in the city Style with Side-walks, but the Houses are indifferent. I am told the water here is bad. There are but two Churches, & they appear to be old Dutch Buildings with wretched gothic Steeples.[8] The Dutch College[9] here I conclude stands no competition with the prosperous college at Princeton. From here to

Rocky Hill is 11 Miles, but here is no appearance of a Town, nothing but a Hill uncommonly rocky designates the Place. The Road to this place is a SW. direction—

Princeton is 7 Miles beyond making in the whole 53 Miles from N York. This Town is seen at a Distance for it stands on a Hill, which has a gradual descent on each Side, & is said to be the highest Ground in this Part of Jersey. The Eye takes a Sweep almost unlimited in every Direction. This Place must be equally pleasant & salubrious. It has about 80 Houses. The College is the only public Building of consequence in any point of View. It stands on the S. Side of the Road facing the North with a smooth Green in front. It is built of Stone, & is 3 Stories high exclusive of the Basement Story, with a small Balcony in the middle. It is 180 feet long & has 42 Chambers for the Students, besides a dining Hall Chapel & Library Room.

Trenton is 12 Miles from Princeton & 65 M. from New York. The Road to it is gently descending nearly all the way. It stands on a fine large flat Plain on the N.E. Bank of the *Delaware,* a little below Princeton we meet with a sample of those excellent Stone-Bridges so universal in Pennsylvania with Stone-Arches, & with Stone-Sides to prevent Accidents to the Passengers, & little wooden Roofs on them to guard the Walls from the Injuries of the Weather. The little Village of Maidenhead[10] lies between Princeton & Trenton, of which however no appearance is discernible except a little modest brick Church.[11] Trenton is the largest Town in Jersey, & the View down & across the delaware is exceedingly pleasant. The delaware here appears to take a turn westward. The Rapids commence here, & this is the head of Tide-water. Above these falls the River continues navigable for Boats. This Town with Lamberton which joins it to the S. contains 200 Houses, & 1500 or 1600 people. The Streets are pretty straight, the Houses on a line with Side-walks. A new Stone Court House faces

[8]The First Reformed Church and Christ Episcopal Church.
[9]Queen's College, now Rutgers University, was founded in 1766.
[10]Lawrenceville.
[11]The Presbyterian Church of Lawrenceville.

the River at the W. End of the Town. Over the River opposite Trenton is a very handsome little Country Seat of Robert Morris, together with a little Village settled by his Tenants &c.[12] He has also here mill seats, Iron works, a slitting Mill &c on a stream which comes from the Delaware above the Falls. At Trenton we cross to the W. Side of the Delaware.

Bristol [Pennsylvania] is 10 Miles below Trenton & 20 N. of Philadelphia. The Road between is for several Miles on a streight Line, & perfectly level. At this Town we come to the Delaware again, for it stands on the Banks on a level Plain, & is a Village about as large as Princeton. The Delaware here is about 1 Mile wide. *Burlington* in Jersey lies nearly opposite to Bristol, a Town nearly as large as Trenton, & superior in many Improvements . . .

Tour to the City of Washington in May 1821

Wednesday May 16th my daughter *Eliza Hone* left the dock at New York at 5 oclock in the morning with me in the Steam Boat *Olive Branch* for Philadelphia. We had a beautiful Sail across N York Bay & up Staten Island Sound, & landed at *South Amboy* by 10 oclock & then went directly across the country in a Post Coach in a near straight Turnpike road to Bordington [Bordentown] on the delaware 3 or 4 Miles below Trenton. The Distance between S. Amboy & Bordington may be 30 Miles. We left Trenton on our right and Monmouth on our left, & we came through *Cranberry Town*[13] Balley's Town, & lost a Trunk on the road which detained us near 2 Hours. The day was warm & pleasant. Robert Lenox Esqr of NY. was in Company.[14] We passed by the Grounds & country Seat of *Joseph Bonaparte* (or King of Naples & Spain) near Bordington & came down on board of the next elegant Steam Boat *Pennsylvania* which has aloft a long & amazing balance Beam tossing in the air. The road across from S. Amboy very flat, & very dull & solitary, & very thin land, but the rich & beautiful views & the activity of the Delaware give a Spring to our Spirits. We Dined on board the Boat, & landed at Philadelphia before six oclock, & lodged at the *Mansion House Hotel* kept by Renshaw, where we were nobly accomodated with a well-furnished Parlor. My dear Daughter greatly fatigued retired to Bed by dusk . . . [15]

[12]Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania.

[13]Cranbury, Middlesex County.

[14]Robert Lenox (1759-1839), father of James Lenox, the book-collector and philanthropist.

[15]Kent and his daughter returned to New York on May 26 on the "Steam Boat *Bellona*." Mrs. Hone "wonderfully improved her health by the Journey."

DIRECTOR'S DIARY

ALEXANDER J. WALL, JR.

PERHAPS you have read in one of the nationwide news magazines the report of the Secretary of Defense's Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War in Korea, released August 17, 1955. In it the Committee explained that the average American prisoner of war, when plunged into a Communist indoctrination mill, was under a serious handicap. Being compelled to participate in debates, he had to tell what he knew about American politics and American history and many times the Chinese or Korean instructors knew more about these subjects than he did. The Committee heard evidence revealing that many American prisoners knew too little about the United States and its ideals and traditions; in consequence of which the indoctrinators had the advantage, making fools of some men and tools of others.

This revealing and rather tragic situation certainly reflects directly upon the pre-military preparation for life afforded not only these men but all of us. The Advisory Committee itself recommended that civilian educational, church, and patriotic groups provide a better understanding of America's heritage and ideals. Surely there can be no more powerful argument for the work of active American historical societies than this. We in New Jersey have always believed in the importance of spreading the American heritage and in recent years we have fortunately been able to enlarge our activities in this endeavor. Although we are doing a nowhere-near-adequate job, it is pleasant to receive the ever-increasing support of our membership who are responding so favorably to the plans recently put into action by the Board of Trustees. Thought cannot be given to an increase in our budget, but there is at least hope of balancing it. Solicitations from members of our Board have resulted in gifts from the following members of the Society since the last issue of the PROCEEDINGS:

Mrs. Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, Far Hills
Mrs. Bancroft Gherardi, Short Hills
Archibald A. Gulick, New York
Herald-News, Passaic
Hon. Robert W. Kean, Livingston
Donald B. Kipp, Morristown
Edward K. Mills, Jr., Morristown

As has been the custom for many years, the Society's building was closed from August first until Labor Day, during which time a thorough cleaning was performed. The quiet summer which preceded our closing allowed time for the staff to catch

up on a number of projects and restore some degree of order following an extremely busy spring.

We were not without some excitement, however, for early in September the Society became the recipient of a large microfilm reader and a storage cabinet with built-in humidifier capable of storing several hundred reels of film. These came as the gift of the *Elizabeth Daily Journal,* which for a number of years has been endeavoring to compile a complete microfilm record covering every single issue of the newspaper since Shepard Kollock founded it in 1779. The Society has made its extensive holdings of this file available to be microfilmed by the Elizabeth *Journal,* and in return our library is to receive from them a complete positive film record of the newspaper, to be continued each year. The receipt of this wonderful gift will do much to stimulate the further enlargement of the Society's microfilm collection. In the years to come it is anticipated that the library will collect a sizable film library to augment its already unexcelled holdings of New Jersey newspapers.

Our library was also very fortunate in being able to obtain, through the generosity of our trustee, Mr. Charles B. Bradley, the part-time services of a Rutgers University Library School student. He is Mr. Orest J. Dutka, who assumed his duties here September 14 and who will continue until the close of school in 1956. Mr. Dutka has as his primary objective the preparation of a survey and guide of the Chief Justice Bradley papers, one of the Society's most extensive manuscript collections.

Speaking of manuscripts, to mark U.S. Constitution week, September 17-23, a case exhibition of documents signed by New Jersey's four signers—David Brearley, William Livingston, William Paterson, and Jonathan Dayton—was installed in the library. In addition to the documents and portraits of the signers, the exhibition featured Brearley's portable writing desk, the recent gift of Miss Margaret Brearley of New York City, a direct descendant.

On July 2 the Society was once again represented on television when President Richard P. McCormick appeared on Governor Meyner's program on WATV. The topic under discussion was the Declaration of Independence and Dr. McCormick in the course of the discussion exhibited documents bearing the signatures of New Jersey's representatives to the Continental Congress. The Society was also well represented at the annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History at Williamsburg, Virginia, September 25-27, by Dr. McCormick and your director, who are members of its Council, and by Mr. Howard Wiseman of the Society's staff.

An active program of events has been planned for the fall season and will include the annual meeting of the Society to be held this year on Wednesday, October 26, comprising a late morning business meeting, a luncheon and an afternoon session, at which Mr. John Cunningham, well-known New

Jersey author, will speak. A fall program of motion pictures has also been planned, the theme being New World explorations and discoveries. The programs will be held on the Saturday mornings of November 5, 12, 19, and 26. There are also plans for a Christmas program to be held on an early December date.

ELSEWHERE IN THE STATE

A link of communication between prehistoric Indian people and modern-day citizens of New Jersey has been opened up during the past month by archaeological excavations at the RCA site on the property of the David Sarnoff Research Center, Princeton. Judging from the types of implements found during the excavation, it has been estimated that this site may have been occupied by Indian hunters making camp there as early as three thousand years ago.

The site, located at the point where the Millstone River and Bear Brook flow together at Princeton Junction, was excavated under the sponsorship of the David Sarnoff Research Center, Radio Corporation of America, by the Archeological Society of New Jersey, State Museum, Trenton. The project was under the supervision of Dr. Dorothy Cross, archeological advisor of the State Museum, and head of the Anthropology Division of Hunter College, New York City. Field work was conducted by Donald D. Hartle, who until recently was an archeologist with the Smithsonian Institution, and is now on the teaching staff at Hunter College.

According to Mrs. Kathryn B. Greywacz, director of the New Jersey State Museum and secretary of the Archeological Society, the RCA Site has been known for many years by local collectors, and was first recorded during a state archeological survey in 1940. The importance of the site, however, was brought to light early this summer when seven test-pit excavations were dug there by the Museum. Fragments of pottery tempered with steatite (soapstone), the earliest type of clay vessel manufactured by the Indians of New Jersey, and a crude, crescent-shaped knife chipped out of shale were excavated from the test pits. In addition to these early materials, later-type tools and pottery were found which indicate that the site was also inhabited at more recent times.

Through the assistance of Dr. Douglas H. Ewing, administrative director, RCA Laboratories, excavations were started at the RCA Site the 26th of July and continued throughout August. During that time over a thousand artifacts were uncovered, and by an analysis of these tools Hartle expects to write a report interpreting the lives and habits of these early inhabitants.

The actual excavation method is a very precise and delicate procedure, which consists of digging a five-foot square in three-inch levels until a depth of thirty inches is reached. The shovel, trowel and whisk broom are the main tools

used to excavate in this manner. After the dirt has been removed, it is then thrown on a screen so that no small objects will be accidentally overlooked. By the use of this manner of excavation, over four thousand cubic feet of dirt have been removed at the RCA site. A depth control of three inches enables the chronology of various types of implements to be determined according to their depth below the surface of the ground, since the earliest tools are located at a greater depth than are the later tools. The RCA site is particularly important because it appears to be less disturbed than most sites in New Jersey, making more accurate dating possible.

Interesting discoveries indicate that this site was used at different times as a camp, providing an unwritten history of the Indians who occupied the area at different periods. The Archaic Period (3000 B.C. or earlier-100 A.D.) is characterized by hunters and food gatherers who utilized larger and cruder tools than were used in the later periods. Steatite carved bowls, fragments of which were found at the RCA site, may have come into use toward the end of the Archaic Period. The carved bowls are believed to have preceded pottery in which clay was mixed with steatite as a tempering material. Steatite-tempered pottery is the earliest type of pottery manufactured by the Indians of New Jersey and is characteristic of the Early Woodland Period (100 A.D.-350 A.D.). This type of pottery and certain types of spearheads which are characteristic of the Early Woodland Period have also been excavated at the RCA site. The later periods of Indian culture and history are well represented at this site, too, by the different types of pottery, spearheads, arrowheads, knives, blades, scrapers, choppers, grinding and abrading stones, and hammerstones. One of the most interesting finds at the site was the discovery of a nearly complete steatite-tempered clay pot which will be reconstructed in the archeological laboratories of the State Museum in the near future.

The State Museum is also featuring a special exhibition on "The Pine Barrens of New Jersey," which will continue through October 30 and which was prepared with the co-operation of the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development. Photographs, maps, kodachrome slides, cranberry and blueberry picking tools, wooden duck decoys, baskets, ship models and ancient cedar shingles tell the story of the many elements which contribute to making the Pine Barrens the unique area that it is.

The Pine Barrens region, which includes within its boundaries the 100,000-acre Wharton tract, part of which was purchased recently by the state of New Jersey, covers about one-fourth of the total land area of New Jersey. It extends into nine of the counties in the southern part of the state—Monmouth, Ocean, Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Atlantic, Salem, Cumberland, and Cape May. Pine and oak on the upland and white cedar in the swamps stretch for endless miles of wilderness, broken only by ponds

and streams of singular beauty. The Pine Barrens now are more sparsely settled than they were one hundred years ago when ironworks, lumbering, charcoaling, ship-building, glass works, and paper mills made the area a beehive of activity. Ruins of old mills, sagging wrecks of houses, piles of iron or glass slag and boarded-up inns are all that remain today in many places, spectres of the past, marking the locations of forgotten towns with such interesting names as Ong's Hat, Double Trouble, Calico, Hog Wallow and Bedbug Hill.

The Museum exhibit shows the industries and life of the people of the past and the present, and the plant and animal life found in the Pine Barrens. One section of the exhibit is devoted to the state forests and parks—Bass River, Lebanon, Parvin, Belleplain, and Penn—which provide a variety of recreational facilities in the Pine Barrens as well as contributing to the preservation of the wildlife and natural beauty of the area.

Equally interesting activities are taking place at the Newark Museum where "An Introduction to Glass," latest in their series of "dictionary exhibitions" opened September 29 with a preview at which Mr. Thomas Buechner, director of the Corning Museum of Glass, spoke on the origins of American glass. The exhibition, which covers American and European glass from the third or fourth century to the present, illustrates the development of familiar forms, their social usage and various techniques of glassmaking. A section of special interest to Jerseymen is that dealing with the glass manufacture of South Jersey. The Museum's collections have been supplemented by examples from the Cooper Union Museum, Corning Museum of Glass, and from a number of private collectors. Another exhibition, "To the Ends of the Earth with Early Explorers," fittingly enough, will open on October 12th and will continue through next June. Maps, models, instruments for navigation and objects from the Museum's collection will show some of the discoveries of the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, and the changes brought about in the concept of the world.

We recently received a very interesting letter from Mrs. Robert Bolster, secretary of the Twinlight Commission of the Highlands, N.J., reporting on the latest activities to preserve the Twin Lights of the Navesink Highlands, a lighthouse reconstructed in 1840 to supplant an earlier one, and located on the highest point on the Atlantic coast. Believing that you, too, would like to know of these developments, we are reproducing some of its contents:

"Our Commission, seven men and two women at present, was appointed by the Mayor of Highlands at the first of the year to carry out the agreement by which the Borough obtained the Lights from the Federal Government. The building and grounds both were in bad shape; there was much vandalism, as well as damage from hurricanes and general neglect.

"The Borough gave us $2000 in the 1955 budget; almost all of this

went for clean-up and replacement of windows, every one of which was smashed. Our next major and urgent task was to repair one of the center apartments for a resident caretaker. We then went on to tear out the partitions in the large apartment under the North Tower and completely restore it as a future marine museum. We also installed public facilities here. I need not mention the many expensive details we had to take care of; however, we just managed to raise enough money each time to meet our expenses, and always remained out of debt!

"We organized and later incorporated our Highlands Twin Light Historical Society in February just before the Jersey Coast Boat Show in Asbury Park, where we had a booth to publicize our cause. We felt, rightly, that the restoration of the famous old Lights should not (and indeed could not) be borne by this small Borough alone. We also knew that many persons wished to help us out.

"However, the purpose of the Society is not to raise money alone. It is rather to organize and maintain the interest of persons from all over the country. Membership in the Society is one dollar or more. Members receive a numbered certificate, a membership card, a newsletter now and then, and are encouraged to visit the Lights and send us suggestions and ideas. Many of our members have done this, have brought in other members, and have even offered volunteer labor.

"Most of the work we have done so far was to meet our Dedication Day deadline, June 25. I may say that the only rain that fell during June or July came down the precise hour of our ceremonies! However, we considered the whole day and the publicity received thereby most gratifying. Since that time, because of the excessive heat and the hurricane warnings, we've not attempted to do much else but welcome visitors. Though the museum room is open for public inspection from 2 to 4 P.M. Saturdays and Sundays, our caretaker, William Kennebeck, often leaves the building open evenings when he is present. The grounds may be visited any time. Over 2000 persons have visited the Lights since the opening and Mr. Kennebeck says all appear thrilled at the view, and enthusiastic about our future plans.

"The North Tower is officially closed to sightseers since we cannot get insurance coverage without an expensive ($500) guard rail around the parapet. The Commission is happy to announce that we have obtained a 500-watt blinker light for the South Tower, identical to the one which the Government de-commissioned five years ago. Boatmen have asked us to replace this Light. Before we can activate it, however, we must wait for permission from the Coast Guard, which we understand is just a matter of 'red tape.'

"We have exhibits for our future museum; we have been promised the old Spermacetti Life Saving station (the country's first) and some old pictures, log books, charts and the like from the Coast Guard. In addition, private individuals have offered a century-old set of ship

building tools, some marine cannon, and old prints and pictures. We have the last flag the Coast Guard flew from the building and another flag with 45 stars. This is a hodge-podge, true, but something to begin with. The only catch is: we lack display cases and tables, and at present have no provision for a guard.

"This winter the Commission hopes to be able to raise about $5000 from contributions to our Historical Society, and by next summer we hope to do a great deal . . . repair the roads, buy picnic tables, get display cases, restore the second central apartment for perhaps our museum 'guard' and second caretaker, put up better directional signs, and repair the North Tower. When there is something in the museum to see, and when the North Tower is repaired, we hope to be able to charge a very small entrance fee.

"The Borough is now negotiating with the Federal Government to obtain the 4½ hilltop acres south of the lighthouse grounds; however, we know nothing for certain yet. Should we obtain this extra property we will clear and decorate it for a picnic and parking area.

"All of us on the Commission are amateurs at this sort of thing; all of us have regular jobs, and it is sometimes difficult to give enough time to our project. We do feel, however, that we have exceeded even our own expectations for this year. We would very much appreciate any ideas or suggestions you have, particularly as to money-raising and the organization of our museum."

A visit to the lighthouse is recommended not only for the unsurpassed view but as an historic site where Marconi experimented with his wireless and where radar was tested in its experimental stages.

Another historic site not far away is the "Church of the Presidents," at Long Branch, which was rededicated on September 11 as the Long Branch Historical Museum. Formerly St. James Chapel when it was founded in 1879, the edifice became famous as the summer place of worship of Presidents Grant, Garfield, Hayes, Arthur, McKinley, Harrison, and Wilson, as well as some of the most famous tycoons of the late nineteenth century. Nearly two hundred were in the audience at the dedication to hear a history of the background of the church from Edgar N. Dinkelspiel, president of the Museum. Rep. James C. Auchincloss of Rumson asked for wholehearted support of the undertaking, and Commissioner Joseph E. McLean of the state Department of Conservation and Economic Development, indicated that some state funds might be available. State Senator Richard R. Stout and Assemblyman Beadleston also spoke. The Museum plans to hold a yearly celebration to be called "The Day of the Presidents" and will develop an exhibition of materials relating to Long Branch during the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

Across the state, the Morristown National Historical Park has received as a bequest of the late Lloyd

Waddell Smith, who died July 2, one of the finest collections of Americana with interest centering on George Washington. An addition to the Park's historical museum is now being planned following a Congressional appropriation of $229,400 to house the collection, which includes several hundred Washington letters, his sword, books, manuscripts and documents of the Revolutionary War period and a collection of 30,000 Indian relics, all found in New Jersey. The addition is expected to be completed in 1956 and is the culmination of Mr. Smith's interest in the area which began with his gift in 1933 of one thousand acres of land to the government for the development of the National Park.

Another new historical society is in the process of being formed. Organizational meetings to incorporate the Lake Hopatcong Historical Society were held on August 24 and September 7. Colonel William A. Lord, Jr., presided as chairman of the organization and Mrs. Alice P. Apostolik, editor of the Lake Hopatcong *Breeze,* is secretary. The meetings evidenced considerable enthusiasm, receiving the backing of the Lake Hopatcong Businessmen's Association as well as many interested citizens of the town. A by-laws committee was appointed and a move was begun to locate suitable headquarters presumably with sufficient room to exhibit many items of historical interest offered to the Society.

The state-owned Von Steuben House, in North Hackensack, has been getting a "face lifting"—or at least a "roof lifting"—while closed to visitors during the summer. The house serves as headquarters and museum for the Bergen County Historical Society and is normally open to the public. Mrs. Olga G. Atkins, supervisor of historic sites in the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, says both the roof and the supporting beams are being replaced. Particular care is given to duplicating the hand-hewn original beams which are exposed to view and of great interest to visitors appreciating the Dutch architecture of the building.

Mrs. Atkins describes the present work as a beginning in the planned development of a "Bergen County Historical Center." An old barn has been moved by the Bergen County Historical Society to land which they own adjoining the Von Steuben property. On the same site the Demarest Memorial Foundation, Inc., has moved the old Demarest House. This building, dating back to 1789, is built of red stone and thought to be the oldest of its type still in existence in the state. It was dismantled stone by stone with each one carefully labeled, then rebuilt at the new site. Eventually the house is intended as a museum.

The Bergen County Historical Society has deeded a portion of its land to the state, and the Highway Department is co-operating to develop a macadam-surfaced parking area which will include the driveway around the Von Steuben House and landscaping of the grounds.

Several highly pertinent gifts

were recently received by the William Trent House in Trenton, according to Mr. R. R. Whitehead, curator. One is a personal account ledger which was kept by Lewis Morris, first governor of New Jersey as a separate province. It is dated 1690-91, covering the two years he lived at Laus Leo in Westchester, N.Y. Governor Morris lived at the Trent House from 1742 until his death in 1746. The other item is an indenture which refers to the sale of a plot of five hundred acres of land in 1723, signed by William Trent. The account book and indenture were presented to the Trent House by the Trenton Historical Society.

Another book of interest, *The Young Clerk's Guide,* compiled by Sir R. H. Counsellour, was given to the Trent House by Mr. Samuel Mountford, president of the Trent House Commission. This book, dated 1682, was once the property of William Trent. It was probably used by him as a guide in drawing up legal documents, since he was not a lawyer.

Through the generosity of the Junior League of Trenton, an oak dresser, English, late seventeenth century, has been added to the furnishings of the house. Another addition has been acquired by the Trent House Association—an English Queen Anne walnut wing chair, a memorial to Miss Bertha M. Barwis, who served so faithfully as president of the Association for a number of years.

On May 31st the Signal Corps, United States Army, dedicated its museum, "Armstrong Hall," at Fort Monmouth in honor of the late Major Edwin H. Armstrong, pioneer in the development of radio communications. At the brief, impressive ceremony in front of the building, Lt. Col. Christopher E. O'Hara, post chaplain, gave the invocation; Major General Victor A. Conrad, commanding general, Fort Monmouth, the welcoming address; and Major Gen. James D. O'Connell, chief signal officer, the dedicatory address. Mr. Harry Houck of Measurements Corp., Boonton, past-president of the Radio Club of America and a close friend of Major Armstrong's since their World War I days at the Signal Corps Laboratory in Paris, unveiled the memorial plaque. Others present were Mr. Samuel C. Myer, great-grandson of Brigadier Gen. Albert J. Meyer, founder of the Signal Corps; Major Gen. J. O. Mauborgne (Retired); Major Gen. George L. Van Deusen (Retired); and Major Gen. Roger B. Colton (Retired).

The Signal Corps here is developing an unusual collection of military communications items, especially those documents and equipments pertaining to the Corps. From a small collection assembled by World War I veterans, and first displayed in the late 1930's, the collection grew to include memorabilia from the Civil War, the Spanish American War, both World Wars, and the Korean conflict, including flags, uniforms, accoutrements, and weapons.

The museum serves a dual purpose. It is a part of the training

program for the young recruit, orienting him in the historical development of today's communications. It is also a favorite center for visitors, military and civilian, American and foreign. Its educational value parallels its appeal in civic-military relations.

This memorial to American military communications with its nucleus in the collection of documents and memorabilia formed by the late Brigadier Gen. Albert J. Myer, founder of the Signal Corps, is a modest beginning. The Signal Corps, like other services of the armed forces, is safeguarding these treasures, waiting for the day when Congress may provide funds to establish a more suitable repository.

The museum is open to visitors daily Monday through Friday, from 10 A.M. to 4:30 P.M., and by special appointment on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Guided tours for groups are also given by appointment. Helen C. Phillips is historian-curator of the Signal Corps Museum.

The Atlantic County Historical Society embarked on a pilgrimage to Batsto in July to view the Batsto Mansion and the surrounding area and to hear Commissioner McLean speak of plans for the development of the Wharton tract and the possible restoration of the village of Batsto. As early as 1776 the ironmaster Charles Read was operating his forges and ironworks here, which became a major source of cannonballs for the Continental Army. Commissioner McLean promised that the state would work hard to preserve the historical buildings and landmarks there. One hundred and twenty of the Society's members attended in a cavalcade of some forty automobiles. The tour included, in addition to the mansion, visits to the old store, the grist mill, still in particularly fine shape, and the barn. Refreshments were served which supplemented the box luncheons guests had brought.

The Somerset County Historical Society capped its Spring activities by the donation to Rutgers University of a fellowship for its Department of History. The recipient of this fellowship, now being selected, will prepare as part of his work toward a master's degree, a critical topical history of the County. The Society counts this as the first step in its plans for securing federal recognition of Middlebrook Encampment and other historic sites in the vicinity. The late Dr. Carle M. Bigelow, of White House, was the moving spirit in this whole fellowship campaign, and his sudden tragic death was a very severe blow to the Society and to the historical world in general. It came just at the successful close of the campaign.

The tremendous publicity attending the dispute over the Chimney Rock Reservoir report, action on which would drown out the history-rich Washington Valley, led the Society to plan as its first fall program an evening devoted to "The Life and Death of Martinsville, N.J.," expository rather than polemic.

ANTIQUER'S ATTIC

MARGARET E. WHITE

When Albert H. Sonn prepared his comprehensive and most valuable work, *Early American Wrought Iron,* published in 1928, Ione M. Sonn helped her father in organizing and revising these three volumes. No one could be better qualified, therefore, to survey for us what is left of Newark's ironware than is Miss Sonn. In addition to photographs, she has made many detailed and charming sketches of early wrought iron that once graced our houses or public buildings. It is regrettable that these cannot be reproduced here. As Miss Sonn and her father before her have pointed out, too little appreciation has been shown for the many good examples of iron-work still to be seen in Newark and vicinity or for the innumerable pieces already thrown on the junk pile. It is to be hoped that in other sections of New Jersey there may be people interested in recording examples of wrought and/or cast iron before it is too late.

HIGHLIGHTS ON NEWARK IRONWARE

No seventeenth-century Newark ironware has come down to us, and as far as is known it did not get into contemporary records. We can only assume what it was like from the ironware in other settlements at the time.

We can be pretty sure that the first permanent Newark houses had in them and on them only the ironware that was absolutely necessary and that it was severely plain—probably "bean" latches, strap and perhaps H and HL hinges, and the simplest kind of bolts, cooking utensils, and fireplace equipment. Life in the young settlement was so hard for the first two generations that there was not time or energy or means for any extras or frills, and the sternly religious character of the people would have been against them anyway.

For some time even the handmade iron nails with the familiar irregular tops and the sharp points that could be clinched at need were so scarce that they must have been sparingly used. So probably few, if any, of the early batten doors were nail-studded.

What we call hardware today was known as ironmongery then and until well into the 1800's. It was hand-wrought, of course, and much of it came from England. Cast-iron articles were classed as hollow ware.

For the eighteenth century the story is a little better. We do have some ironware of that period, but it is late; the first fifty years are a blank on

that score. The two choicest examples are the handsome weather vane on "Old First" Presbyterian Church on Broad Street and the attractive though less elaborate one on the old stone schoolhouse in the Museum garden. The tulip motif scrolls below the arrow on the school vane of 1784 are exactly like those on the fine vane of 1791 that still points the wind on the spire of the old Springfield Church. The same smith must have fashioned both. Was he of German extraction, or did he come from the German section of Pennsylvania? The tulip motif, and the heart in the Springfield vane, were characteristic of decorations in both places. But, of course, he may just have copied them.

There is said to have been a vane pierced with an early 1700 date on the spire of the second structure of "Old First." Unfortunately, nobody cared enough to preserve it when that building was razed about 1808 or 1809.

The appealingly simple vane on Trinity Cathedral spire seems to be of copper; but there are two choice relics of ironware, of what appear to be eighteenth-century date, on the inner front doors of this building, and the outline of a third.

What was once a Housatonic (Connecticut)-type Suffolk thumblatch similar to the eighteenth-century ones on the Plates 59 and 61, Volume 1 of A. H. Sonn's *Early American Wrought Iron,* is now serving as a handle on one of these doors. Its original use was so far forgotten that it was mounted with the opening for the thumbpress on the bottom instead of the top.

The upper hinges on the two inside center front doors of Trinity, with wrapped joints and a fine curved sweep, are of eighteenth-century design too. (Compare with a very similar one, Plate 131, Volume 2, Sonn, *op. cit.*) They may date from the early nineteenth century, perhaps when the second structure of Trinity was built in 1809 or at a later remodeling. The pattern, at least, is old.

Below the handle on the left door of this center pair is the outline of either a bolt or a latch-lock escutcheon of colonial pattern. (For examples in Pennsylvania dating from about the 1740's see Plate 98, Volume 1, and Plates 118 and 121, Volume 2, Sonn, *op. cit.*)

Less important perhaps but also interesting are the two worn and ruggedly plain footscrapers at the entrance to "Old First" (1787-91), and the five different old shutter fasteners of eighteenth-century pattern on the rectory of the House of Prayer (the old Plume house) and the one or two still left on the old Sydenham (Sidman) house on De Graw Avenue.

At another eighteenth-century house in what was once Newark township but is now East Orange—the old Elihu Pierson house on North Arlington Avenue—there are two old ironware treasures. Though no longer in use, a fine wrought-iron knocker latch with heart-shaped escutcheon is still cherished. So are the quaint ox-shoe hinges on a cellar door. The main section of this house was built in 1764, the former kitchen wing probably earlier.

Even in the later 1600's when Newark was settled, some of the ironware —the pots, pans, kettles, and some of the firedogs—were cast iron. More and more cast iron came into use during the 1700's, things like chimney backs and jamb plates and the first Franklin stoves, often called fireplaces because they really were small-scale iron fireplaces extending into the rooms.

In 1768, Newarkers could have bought cast-iron firebacks, hearth and jamb plates, firedogs, iron sash weights that were "two pence the pound cheaper than those of lead," as well as cooking utensils and other cast-iron ware at what was considered the town's first foundry—the Vesuvius Air Furnace. It was established by three of the Newark Ogdens—Gabriel, Lewis and Moses—in partnership with Edward Laight of New York. The ore for the foundry came mostly from Morris and Sussex County mines, in some of which the Ogden family had interests from time to time.

This furnace was on Washington Street at James, about where the Second Presbyterian Church stands. Moses Ogden managed it, and his home was just a little north of it on Washington Street. By the 1790's it was best known for its stoves, and it continued in operation until shortly before 1810 when it made way for the first structure of the church. There is no record of its continuance anywhere else.

In the nineteenth century, cast iron really took over almost completely. The old hand-wrought hardware gave way to cast iron, often following the earlier hand-wrought patterns. Doorknobs came in and with them the cast-iron box locks and later cast-iron keyholes protected by covers that matched the knobs. Instead of door knockers there were bell pulls on the front door jambs. The iron founders of the 1830's and 40's were also bell hangers. These pull bells were followed by bell twists usually above or below the letter slots on the front doors of the 1870's, 80's and 90's.

Stoves for home heating and cooking began to come into general use in the 1820's and 30's. Some of the parlor ones were almost incredibly fantastic in design. Newark foundries were turning them out, but the merchants also handled out-of-town makes.

Toward the end of the 1850's, Newark stores began to put on iron fronts. This was followed in the 1880's and 90's by a vogue for ornamental sheet-iron cornices and bays.

The nineteenth-century iron porch railings, balconies, basement window grilles, and lacy iron porches in Newark sometimes combined wrough iron and cast iron with excellent effect and pleasing lightness; but many of the later examples were heavy and ugly. The only lacy iron porch I know of in the old Newark area is a very fine one on the old building of the Bloomfield Seminary. A few porch railings of the 1840's are still in use on the brick row in Fulton Street built by the Van Rensselaers. There are some later railings and newels, basement window grilles, and even a balcony or

two, still in place; but it won't be for long. Almost overnight they disappear.

From about the 1840's on, the footscrapers were built into the porch railings close to the newels. By all odds the most unusual ones I have yet seen anywhere were two solitary examples on the sidewalk close to the porch steps at 48 and 50 New Street. The one shown was twenty-seven inches high and twelve inches wide, and its neighbor was a little bigger. The houses they served dated from the 1850's or early 60's and were near the old Connison and Helm Foundry.

Much of the cast iron cresting that graced every available inch of the roofs and window lintels of the mansards of the 1860's and later, was of fine design and is still to be seen, though it is fast disappearing.

There was even a vogue for cast iron gravestones in the 1870's, though that was really not a new idea. Some eighteenth-century iron worker had had the same inspiration, for not long ago a cast iron gravestone marked "N.I.—1717" was unearthed at Exton Farm, High Point, New Jersey, near the ruins of an old forge.

Newarkers could get most of this ironware locally, for Newark foundries were producing it as early as the 1830's. Smith and Wilcox at 11 Bank Street, and Cyphers and Duvall on Canal Street near Cherry, were advertising iron stoop railings "plain and ornamental" in the late 1830's and were also doing bell-hanging.

Another noted Newark foundry was Ward's Globe Ironworks on Market and Congress streets opposite the Gas Works. This was ready for business in June of 1850. I found one store on New Street with iron columns stamped with the Ward name, and this foundry also made the ironwork for the new city hall in 1864.

Masters in this field were Cyrus Edwards and Matthew Ely, who were in business from the 1840's and supplied quantities of the ironwork on Newark houses and buildings for many years. The finest example of nineteenth-century cast-iron ware still functioning in Newark is the handsome gateway at Mt. Pleasant Cemetery. Mr. William Webb, secretary of the Mt. Pleasant Cemetery Company, who very kindly looked up the records for me, says these gates were made by Cyrus Edwards in 1877 and cost $594.

There are still many good examples of later nineteenth-century ironware in Newark that are well worth collecting and preserving, but every day more of it is discarded and lost. If the ironware itself cannot be kept, at least the best examples could and should be photographed as a record. So much of it was locally made, and the iron industry has been so important for so long in Newark, that future generations ought to be able both to see and study examples. It is really an essential part of Newark's history and cultural heritage.—Ione M. Sonn.

THE NEW JERSEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Class of 1955

Dominic A. Cavicchia
Wilson C. Ely
Mrs. Frederick Frelinghuysen
Charles C. Gardner
William A. Hughes
Msgr. James F. Kelley
Richard V. Lindabury
Richard P. McCormick
Henry W. Pilch
Reeve Schley
Thomas T. Taber

Class of 1956

Perry Shoemaker
Donald A. Sinclair
Rt. Rev. Benjamin M. Washburn
Russell E. Watson
Lloyd M. Felmly
Frederick H. Groel
Mrs. Joseph W. Greene
Charles B. Bradley
Frederick Frelinghuysen
Donald B. Kipp

Class of 1957

Hon. John O. Bigelow
Hiram E. Deats
Damon G. Douglas
Hon. Guy L. Fake
Edward J. Grassman
John W. Griggs
Howard L. Hughes
William L. Maude
Henry S. Puder
Mrs. W. Clark Symington

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

American Insurance Company, 1953
L. Bamberger & Company, 1949
Bremer Broadcasting Company, WAAT, 1951
Damon G. Douglas Company, 1946
Dollin Corporation, 1955
Esso Standard Oil Company, 1951
Firemen's Insurance Company, 1951
Flockhart Foundry Company, Newark, 1955
Howard Savings Institution, 1955
Koos Bros. Furniture Company, 1953
National Newark and Essex Banking Company, 1955
National State Bank of Newark, 1955
New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, 1948
Newark News, 1951 (sustaining 1938-51)
Newark Public Library, 1949
Prudential Insurance Company, 1951
Public Service Electric and Gas Company, 1955
Puder & Puder, 1954
Reach, Yates & Mattoon, Inc., 1951